# WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & DAVIS

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

NASHVILLE CITY CENTER 511 UNION STREET, SUITE 2100 Post Office Box 198966 NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37219-8966

> (615) 244-6380 FAX (615) 244-6804 www wallerlaw com

2007-331-9 Fr 3:55

WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & DAVIS
A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY.
BOS SOUTH MAIN STREET Post Office Box 1035 COLUMBIA, TENNESSEE 38402-1035 (931) 388-6031

WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & DAVIS, LLP AFFILIATED WITH THE PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY 520 South Grand Avenue, Suite 800 Los Angeles, California 90071 (213) 362-3680

D. Billye Sanders (615) 850-8951 billye sanders@wallerlaw com

July 9, 2004

# VIA HAND DELIVERY

Pat Miller, Chairman C/O Sharla Dillion, Docket Manager Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Re:

Chattanooga Gas Company Actual Cost Adjustment (ACA)

Audit: Docket Number 03-00516

Response of Chattanooga Gas Company to the Energy and

Water Division's Compliance Audit Report

Dear Chairman Miller,

Enclosed you will find the original and thirteen copies of Chattanooga Gas Company's Response to the Energy and Water Division's Compliance Audit of the Actual Cost Adjustment Component of the Purchase Gas Adjustment Rule filed on June 4, 2004. Chattanooga Gas Company respectfully requests that the TRA reject the Staff's finding number 3 and reject recommendations 1 and 2 for the reasons set forth in its Response.

Sincerely,

D. Billye Sanders

Attorney for Chattanooga Gas

Bellya Sanders

Company

DBS/hmd

# WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & DAVIS

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

July 9, 2004 Page 2

cc: Archie Hickerson
Bryan Batson
Elizabeth Wade, Esq.
John Ebert, Esq.

# BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

July 9, 2004

IN RE:			
CUAMMANOCCA CAC COMPANY	)	Docket No.	03-00516
CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY ACTUAL COST ADJUSTMENT AU	/ የጥ ነ	Docket No.	03-00310
ACTUAL CODI INDUDITANI III	,		
RESPONSE OF CHATTANOOGA	C COMPANY TO	MUP PNIPDCY	AND WATER
	MPLIANCE AUDIT		AND WATER

Chattanooga Gas Company ("CGC" or the "Company") respectfully submits the following response to the June 4, 2004 *Notice of Filing by the Energy and Water Division of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority* ("Staff Audit Report" or "Report") in the above-captioned docket. The purpose of this response is to address Staff's Finding #3 and the corresponding Recommendations listed in Section IX. On the basis of this response, and for the reasons discussed herein, CGC respectfully requests that the Tennessee Regulatory Authority ("TRA") reject Staff's Finding #3 and Recommendations #1 and 2.

### INTRODUCTION

While Staff's Report is titled "Compliance Audit Report of the Actual Cost

Adjustment Component of the Purchased Gas Adjustment Rule for Chattanooga Gas

Company," the Staff extended the scope of its audit to include filings under the

Interruptible Margin Credit Rider ("IMCR") provision of CGC's tariff. Report at 5

The Company concurs with the Staff's findings relative to the Actual Cost Adjustment

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff's Report contains four Findings CGC concurs with Findings # 1, 2 and 4

("ACA") filing, but does not agree with Finding # 3 that deals exclusively with the filings and sharing under its IMCR tariff provision.

At the outset, CGC would like to emphasize that it has worked very hard to communicate with the TRA Staff and to ensure that both its past and current sharing arrangements comply with its IMCR tariff provision and provide the most benefits to its ratepayers. Toward that end, CGC entered into the Gas Storage Asset Bailment. Agreement with Sequent Energy Management, LP ("Sequent") on May 1, 2001 (the "Agreement"). Under the Agreement, which was effectively an "off-system" sale as provided in the tariff, Sequent agreed to pay CGC \$300,000 annually that was to be credited to CGC's ratepayers even if Sequent lost money. AGL Services Company's ("AGLS") former Director of Rates and Regulatory Analysis conducted a thorough review of prior off-system sales and determined that \$300,000<sup>2</sup> represented a reasonable sharing of the potential gains based on history and the market conditions as known at that time. This bailment fee was also reviewed for reasonableness by an independent auditor, Deloitte and Touche, and found to be reasonable (See Attachment A).

To ensure that the TRA was fully informed of the bailment transaction, representatives of CGC and Sequent met with the TRA Staff in 2001(as noted in Mr. Hal Novak's June 23, 2004 Memorandum and Notice of Conflict to the TRA directors, Attachment P), to discuss the bailment and the \$300,000 annual credit that would be provided to CGC's customers in accordance with the IMCR tariff provision in place at that time—Subsequently, CGC pointed out the bailment and annual sharing in its March

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>This \$300,000 annual payment was equivalent to sharing \$600,000 gain from off-system sales At that time, CGC's IMCR tariff provided that CGC share 50% of gain from off-system sales if such sales occur. The rider did not provide for the sharing of gain from any other non-jurisdictional transactions that utilize such assets

25, 2002 IMCR filing (Attachment B) and again in its May 27, 2003 filing (Attachment C).

During the time the Agreement was in place, CGC continued to monitor the market. When it became apparent in late 2002 that changing market conditions warranted a new arrangement, CGC, on its own initiative, undertook to eliminate the bailment relationship effective December 31, 2002. In early 2003 Sequent implemented a new system that allowed it to track the revenue generated from each utility's assets separately. After a thorough analysis and discussions with the Staff, in June 2003 CGC amended its tariff retroactively in order to maximize credits for its ratepayers. The amended tariff made all transactions with non-jurisdictional customers beginning January 1, 2003 subject to sharing, not just the off-system sales as provided under the previous tariff (See Tariff, attached as Attachment D, and Letter from Staff approving the Tariff, attached as Attachment E).

Despite CGC's efforts to keep the Staff informed and to ensure there was no question concerning compliance with the tariff, the Staff now contends that the bailment arrangement and fee did not comply with CGC's IMCR tariff, that the Authority should consider sanctions and/or penalties against CGC for failure to document off-system sales margin; and that CGC should be required to develop a reasonable method for recalculating the IMCR credits for January 2002-December 2002.

First, with respect to whether the arrangement violated CGC's tariff, it is important to note that until this Report, the TRA Staff or the agency *never* questioned the treatment of the bailment as an off-system sale under the IMCR provision in the tariff or questioned the fairness of the level of the credit to CGC's customers. Moreover, as is

more thoroughly outlined below, CGC repeatedly informed the Staff of this arrangement and the Staff never expressed any dissatisfaction. Had the Staff indicated to the Company its concerns in a timely manner, CGC could have forgone or terminated the bailment. Ultimately, the Staff did not object to the Agreement and the fixed payment because it was in the best interest of the ratepayers at the time. <sup>3</sup> CGC is perplexed by the Staff's sudden change of heart. <sup>4</sup>

Even more disturbing is Staff's recommendation that CGC be required to recalculate the IMCR credits for January 2002-December 2002 in light of the Staff's treatment of a similar situation in its *Compliance Audit Report of Nashville Gas Company's Incentive Plan Account* in Docket No. 03-00489 (March 24, 2004) ("Nashville Gas Audit Report") (Attachment F). In that docket, the Staff argued it was an error to include the "asset management payment" for sharing under Nashville Gas Company's Incentive Plan because the tariff did not provide for an asset management fee. Nashville Gas Audit Report at 13. Moreover, Staff complained that Nashville Gas Company was unable to provide the basis for the amount of the fee and "logic dictates that the asset manager is making profits well in excess of the payment made to Nashville." *Id* However, the Staff concluded that "the Company acted in good faith by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In fact, CGC met with the Staff before terminating the Agreement. Although Staff now complains that the fixed payment was inappropriate, at the time Staff expressed concern over CGC's decision to terminate the Agreement because CGC would not be guaranteed a payment under its tariff

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Staff now claims that "*until the current audit period* Staff was still operating under the impression that the \$300,000 fee met the threshold of a 50/50 sharing of off-system sales margin" Report at 13 (Emphasis added) While the Staff was aware of the annual payment since 2001, had reviewed the IMCR credit filings for 2002 and 2003, had completed previous ACA audits, and had reviewed and in the letter of July 15, 2003 approved CGC's revised IMCR tariff provision, (Attachment E) the Staff now explains its determination that the fee may have been unreasonable for the January 1, 2002 – December 1, 2002 time period is based on a review of the results of the sharing under the new tariff provision that was implemented at the request of CGC effective January 1, 2003 – However, as will be discussed later in this response, an analysis of the 2003 activity compared with the 2002 activity shows that the \$300,000 credit provided to CGC's customers was fair and reasonable

Authority." Id. Emphasis added As such, the Staff recommended that Nashville Gas Company eliminate the payment on a going forward basis, but did not recommend sanctions or a re-calculation of the credits. Id. CGC does not understand why the Staff is recommending the exact opposite with respect to the bailment fee. CGC clearly acted in good faith. The Company met with the Staff and discussed the bailment Agreement and payment, and identified and included the bailment fee under its IMCR filing in accordance with the tariff provision based on Staff's failure to express any concern with the arrangement on multiple occasions. This disparate treatment seems particularly incredible in light of the fact that CGC, on its on accord, eliminated the fixed bailment fee effective December 2002

Moreover, in addition to recalculating its IMCR credits, the Staff argues that CGC should be penalized because Sequent did not separately track the revenue generated from Sequent's management of CGC's assets. As CGC previously explained in data request responses, Sequent did not track this information due to the nature of the Agreement and the bailment fee. It is simply unfair for Staff to acquiesce in the very arrangement that resulted in Sequent not maintaining such records and then attempt to argue this lack of records somehow warrants sanctions and/or penalties. CGC is committed to working with the Staff, but it should not be penalized for acting in good faith.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Sequent did track the volumes, however, there is no correlation between volumes and revenues As is more thoroughly explained in this response, after CGC ended the bailment arrangement and fee, Sequent did in fact put systems in place to track such revenue

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> In addition, in the Nashville Gas Audit Report the Staff failed to recommend sanctions and/or penalties for Nashville Gas Company's failure to maintain records supporting the asset management payment

Finally, CGC's commitment to ensuring that ratepayers receive the appropriate credit under the Purchased Gas Adjustment Rule ("PGA Rule") is evidenced in the Staff's Report. Indeed, the TRA Staff determined that "except for the findings noted herein, the Purchased Gas Adjustment mechanism, as calculated in the Actual Cost Adjustment, appears to be working properly." Report at 1. Moreover, the monetary findings associated with Staff's Findings for Items #1, 2 and 4 are "not material." *Id.* CGC concurs with Staff's Findings with respect to these items. However, Staff's Finding for Item #3 with respect to the Agreement and the bailment fee misses the mark.

CGC responds to each of Staff's Audit Recommendations as follows:

#### I. Staff Audit Recommendation #1

The Authority should consider sanctions and/or penalties against Chattanooga for failure to document off-system sales margin in order to comply with the terms of its IMCR tariff.

### Response:

Sanctions or penalties are not warranted because CGC did not violate its IMCR tariff by failing to keep documentation of revenue generated from Sequent's management of CGC's assets. The bailment was effectively an "off-system" sale under the IMCR tariff provision. The \$300,000 annual credit to the customers (which was equivalent to a \$600,000 gain from individual "off-system" sales) was developed by AGLS's former. Director of Rates and Regulatory Analysis, and as explained to the Staff, satisfied the sharing provisions of the IMCR tariff; thus, it was unnecessary for Sequent to separately track the revenue generated from Sequent's management of CGC's assets. Staff never indicated to the contrary during the time the Agreement was in place.

Significantly, CGC made certain that Staff was aware of the Agreement and the fee CGC met with the Staff and discussed the arrangement in 2001. Moreover, in a March 25, 2002 filing to credit customers for gains under the IMCR<sup>7</sup> (Attachment B), ... CGC again informed the Staff of the Agreement and its terms <sup>8</sup> and treated the Agreement as an "off-system" sale in accordance with the IMCR provision of the tariff. Under that filing CGC implemented a credit to refund to ratepayers the payments from Sequent for the period of May 1, 2001 through December 2001. On March 26, 2002 the Staff responded to the filing and acknowledged:

Also included in this filing is an IMCR refund consisting of Off-System Sales profits (50% of which is refunded to the customers), payments received through the Company's Asset Management Agreement, and the balance of the prior 99-00 IMCR. I have reviewed this filing and it appears to be correct (Attachment G). (Emphasis Added)

The Staff made no mention of a concern with the Agreement, the fee, or the treatment of the Agreement as an off-system sale. Likewise, the arrangement with Sequent remained in place during the July 2001-June 2002 period that was previously audited by the Staff. On May 27, 2003 CGC again filed to credit its customers the \$300,000 fee for the period of January 2002 through December 31, 2002 (See Attachment C). In that filing, the bailment arrangement and fee was again identified and treated as an "off-system" sale in accordance with the IMCR tariff, and a credit implemented to refund the payment to CGC's customers. On June 16, 2003 the Staff responded and stated:

<sup>7</sup> The filing was initially made on February 28, 2002 The filing was later amended

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> "In addition, effective May 1, 2001, the Company entered into an Asset Management Agreement with its affiliate, Sequent Energy Management, L P Under the Asset Management Agreement, the Company assigns its firm pipeline capacity, storage, and supply rights to the Asset Manager in exchange for an annual fee of \$300,000 to be paid in equal monthly payments of \$25,000 per month" March 25, 2002 letter to Mrs Pat Murphy, TRA Energy and Water Division, from Earl Burton, Manager Rates/Marketing, CGC (Attachment B)

This is to acknowledge receipt of you letter dated May 27, 2003, enclosing PGA/Tariff filing revision for Chattanooga Gas Company. The tariff revision was made to reflect the termination of the current Actual Cost Adjustment (ACA) factors and the Interruptible Margin Credit Rider (IMCR) refund credits. It also implements a new IMCR refund credit for calendar year ended December 31, 2002. I have reviewed this filing and it appears to be in order. Therefore, the rates contained therein are approved to be effective July 1, 2003. (Emphasis added)

Subsequently, on June 30, 2003 the Staff issued a data request again acknowledging the Agreement and asked:

Item 7. Please quantify the benefits to Chattanooga's customers under the new tariff language, as compared to the \$300,000 payment from Sequent under the Asset Management Agreement. What would the benefit have been during the calendar year 2002? What is it projected to be during calendar year 2003? <sup>9</sup>(Emphasis added)(See Attachment H)<sup>10</sup>

While the Staff had been advised of the bailment Agreement during the 2001 meeting, had been notified of the Agreement again in the March 25, 2002 IMCR filing and again in the May 27, 2003 IMCR filing, as well as in discussions and the data request concerning the revised IMCR tariff provisions effective January 1, 2003, no mention of any concern or alleged tariff violation was communicated to the Company until the draft ACA Audit Report for the twelve months ended June 30, 2003 was provided to the Company on May 24, 2004.

Based on the very open nature of this process and the lack of any communications to the contrary from the Staff or any such findings in any previous audit, CGC is completely taken aback that Staff is now suggesting that sanctions or penalties are appropriate. CCG acted in good faith in keeping the Staff informed of the implementation of the bailment Agreement and its subsequent termination. Perhaps

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> June 30, 2003 e-mail and letter from Mrs Pat Murphy, Senior Financial Analyst, Energy and Water Division Tariff Filing No 03-00408

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> CGC Responded on July 10, 2003 See Attachment I Based on this response, the Staff was aware that CGC did not separately document revenue generated from Sequent's management of CGC's assets

there may have been some miscommunication or misunderstandings within the Staff due as a result of having had four different Energy and Water Division Chiefs and one interim Chief in the past three years. However, it is simply unfair for CGC to be penalized for any such misunderstanding. If Staff had informed CGC of its concerns at any time, CGC would have gladly worked with the Staff to resolve any issues.

#### II. Staff Audit Recommendation #2

The Authority should instruct Chattanooga to provide a reasonable method to determine a <u>fair</u> amount that should be refunded to Chattanooga customers for the use of the assets they have paid for during the period January 2002 through December 2002. Should the Company be unable or unwilling to provide a reasonable method, Staff recommends that Chattanooga customers be refunded 50% of the gross margin on <u>all</u> transactions that Sequent engaged in using <u>all</u> assets at its disposal during this period.

### Response:

As previously explained, the bailment was an "off-system" sale that effectively produced a \$600,000 gain under the IMCR tariff provision that remained in effect until January 1, 2003. The \$300,000 fee credited to CGC's customers reflected a fair and reasonable payment based on the market conditions as known at the time. The Staff never informed CGC of any concern that the annual payment did not satisfy CGC's sharing obligations under its IMCR tariff. Had the Staff indicated to the Company its concerns in a timely manner, CGC could have forgone or terminated the bailment. Agreement, the guaranteed annual credit of \$300,000 and continued to handle the individual "off-system" sales transactions as it had in the past. Believing in good faith that the TRA had no concern with the bailment Agreement, neither CGC nor Sequent maintained the detailed records to allow the calculation of the gain from individual "off-system" sales from May 1, 2001 through December 31, 2002. Moreover, consistent

with the Staff's Nashville Gas Audit Report, even if the TRA finds the fixed bailment fee was inappropriate, the proper remedy is to eliminate it on a going forward basis, which CGC has already undertaken.

Nevertheless, CGC provides the following analysis that illustrates that the \$300,000 payment in 2002 was fair and reasonable. In the Report, the Staff points to the approximately \$1 3 million credit for 2003 non-jurisdictional transactions and implies that the payment in 2002 should have been greater than \$300,000. While on the surface such a comparison may appear to support the Staff's position, an actual comparison of the result from CGC affiliates in other jurisdictions reveal that market conditions and the resulting gain realized differed greatly for the two years. 11

Under the provisions of an agreement with Virginia Natural Gas, Inc. (VNG), Sequent manages the assets and shares the gain from transactions that rely on VNG's gas supply assets with VNG's customers. Under that agreement, the gain from the use of such assets was tracked in both 2002 and 2003 using a procedure that is consistent with the procedure now in place for CGC. For calendar year 2002, the total gain from the use of VNG's assets subject to sharing was \$1,402,487.96. The change in the market conditions and activity, however, resulted in an increase in the gain to \$4,744,429.25<sup>12</sup>in 2003. The 2002 gain therefore was only 29.6% of the shareable gain in 2003. (\$1,402,487.96 - \$4,744,429.25 = 29.6%)

Correspondingly, in 2003 CGC shared \$1,260,974 under the current tariff that provides for sharing gain from all transactions, not just off-system sales. Since CGC and

CGC met with the Staff on June 17, 2004 and provided the support for this analysis to the Staff at that meeting

The difference in the gain for CGC and VNG is reflective of the difference in the size of the operations and the underlying supply assets CGC serves approximately 59,000 customers while VNG serves approximately 251,000 customers

VNG operate under similar market conditions, it is reasonable that CGC's shareable gain in 2002 would have been a similar relative percentage of the 2003 gain as VNG's.

(29 6% X \$1,260,974 = \$373,248). While the computed \$373,248 is somewhat greater than the \$300,000 credited to its customers, it should be recognized that the \$1,260,974 for 2003 was for the gain from all transactions supported by CGC's gas supply assets, not just off-system sales as provided under the tariff effective prior to January 1, 2003.

An analysis of the sharing by Atlanta Gas Light Company (AGLC) in Georgia produces similar results. For calendar year 2003 AGLC made a contribution to the Georgia Universal Service Fund (USF) of \$4,681,076 which was 50% of the gain from transactions that rely on AGLC's gas supply assets. In its December 24, 2002 Order in Docket 16193, the Georgia Public Service Commission adopted a Universal Service Fund Audit report that found the corresponding contribution for calendar year 2002 to be \$996,123 or 21 3% of the shared gain for calendar year 2003. (\$996,123 – \$4,681,076 = 21 3%) Since AGLC's gas supply assets are also managed by Sequent in the same manner as CGC's, it is again reasonable that CGC's shareable gain in 2002 would have been a similar relative percentage of the 2003 gain as was AGLC's. (21.3% X \$1,260,974 = \$268,588) This computed share is somewhat less than the \$300,000 that was credited to CGC's customers.

Computed Share Based On VNG	\$373,248 <sup>13</sup>
Guaranteed Payment per Agreement	\$300,000
Computed Share Based on AGLC	\$268,588

<sup>13 (</sup>Attachment O)

It should be recognized that the analysis above is based on data that became available after the fact and included gain from activity that was not anticipated under the IMCR tariff in effect in 2002 and earlier, while the \$300,000 annual payment provided for in the bailment Agreement was based on off-system sales for the period of July 1, 1998 through June 30, 2000. During this period, the average monthly sharing amount was \$13,144.58 or approximately \$157,000 per year. For the twelve months ended June 30, 1999 the customer's share was approximately \$103,000 and for the twelve months ended June 30 2000 it was \$212,000.<sup>14</sup> Rather than using the \$157,000 as the annual credit, the annual credit was increased to \$300,000 to reflect possible increase in the gain as a result of Sequent's ability to generate additional activity. The July 1998 through June 2000 time period was selected because it reflected the normal conditions and the reasonably anticipated level of activity in the immediate future After AGLC's<sup>15</sup> purchase of CGC, AGLC's and CGC's gas purchases and supply assets were managed in a coordinated manner in order to maximize efficiency. In 1998, AGLC exited the retail natural gas market when the market was deregulated in Georgia. With fewer assets to coordinate, the corresponding opportunities for CGC's off-system sales declined below the levels that had occurred in prior years. Since periods prior to 1998 did not reflect current normal conditions, the period of July 1998-June 2000 was used to determine the expected opportunity for gain from off-system sales As an additional assurance of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> In the Report the Staff points out that the sharing for the period of July 2000 – April 2001 was \$909,000 This information was provided to the Staff in the November 17, 2000 ACA/IMCR filing (Attachment M) and the March 25, 2002 filing (Attachment B) While the Staff had this information since March 2002, it first addressed the issue in the current ACA audit report. A review of the July 2000-April 2001 period shows that July 2000 was an abnormal month. For that month the customers' share of the gain was \$508,061. When this month is excluded, the annual average sharing for the period of July 1998 through April 2001 was approximately \$261,000 (Attachment N).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> AGLC was CGC's parent company until October 2000 when the holding company, AGL Resources, became the parent of both AGLC and CGC

reasonableness of the bailment fee, AGL Resources Inc. engaged the firm of Deloitte & Touche to evaluate the reasonableness of the bailment fee. As stated in Attachment A, the firm found the payment to be reasonable.

#### III. Staff Audit Recommendation #3

The Company should be instructed to make sure a system is in place to track all transactions made using Chattanooga's assets going forward.

### Response:

CGC is already complying with this recommendation. On June 16, 2003 CGC filed the Sixth Revised Sheet No. 48 of its tariff that provides that the gain from all transactions, not just off-system sales, are to be shared 50/50 with its customers (Attachment D). On July 15, 2003 the Staff issued a letter approving the tariff revision effective January 1, 2003 (Attachment E). When CGC terminated the Agreement in December 2002, Sequent implemented a tracking system to document revenue generated from all transactions using CGC's assets. Information from this system was the basis of the February 27, 2004 filing referenced by the Staff on page 10 of the Report.

To avoid future conflicts and to ensure no misunderstanding, CGC hopes to meet with Staff to discuss how this system works

#### IV. Staff Audit Recommendation #4

Considering the confusion arising in this audit over the use of an affiliated asset manager, the Authority should consider formalizing an amendment to the IMCR tariff addressing the basic requirements for affiliate agreements such as this one.

#### Response:

CGC is currently in the process of finalizing a new Asset Management
Agreement, which will require Sequent to ensure that its payments for management of

CGC's assets are in accordance with CGC's amended IMCR tariff. As such, it is unnecessary for CGC to amend its tariff. CGC will provide this and any other such new Agreement for review.

### V. Staff Audit Recommendation #5

Due to the complexity of current market conditions and the affiliate arrangement existing between Chattanooga and Sequent, the Authority should engage an outside consultant to assist Staff in future audits of Chattanooga's ACA Account and Incentive Plan. This consultant would work under the direction of the TRA Staff, with consulting fees paid for by Chattanooga and reimbursed by the ratepayers in the Actual Cost Adjustment.

### Response:

If the TRA determines that its Staff does needs assistance with additional expertise to properly complete a review of the IMCR credits reflected in the ACA filing required under TRA Rule 1220-4-7-.03 (2), the Company does not object to the engagement of a qualified consultant to supplement the Staff. The Company, however, believes that it should be an active participant in the selection of such a consultant and that the consultant should be prohibited from disclosing confidential third party and/or trade secret data. Further, CGC does not object to Staff's proposed method of paying for and recovering the associated costs.

However, in this recommendation the Staff noted that the consultant should also be used to assist in the audit of CGC's "Incentive Plan" Unlike the other two major gas utilities under the TRA's jurisdiction, CGC does not have an "Incentive Plan" in place.

The Company's tariff does include a Performance Based Ratemaking ("PBR") provision that provides for a waiver of the required consultant audit under TRA Rule 1220-4-7-.05 if gas purchases fall within specified benchmarks (Attachment J) As such, CGC would object to the consultant participating in an audit of its PBR filing to the extent its gas

purchases fall within the specified benchmarks. To find otherwise would negate the intent of the PBR. It should also be noted that the Staff expressed no concern relative to the complexity of the current market conditions, the affiliate arrangement, or the need for a consultant to assist the Staff in its annual review of CGC's annual PBR filing in its April 2004 Compliance Audit Report of Chattanooga Gas Company's Incentive Plan Account, Docket No. 03-00514.

### VI. Other Issues – Staff's Review of Supplier Invoices

Staff contends that CGC's restriction on its ability to retain copies of third party supplier invoices to Sequent hindered its investigation and resulted in a limitation of the scope of the review. As CGC previously explained to Staff, it has no objection to providing copies of these documents to Staff under appropriate conditions. However, due to the highly confidential nature of the invoices that include unrelated third party data, public dissemination could result in a severe competitive disadvantage for Sequent and/or the unrelated third parties. In order to protect the data, CGC proposed to make the documents available at its counsel's office, and agreed to provide copies of the documents pursuant to a Protective Order. In discussions with the Company, the Staff agreed that if it had possession of the documents, the documents would be subject to public disclosure without a Protective Order. While the Staff initially indicated that a Protective Order was an option (Attachment K), it subsequently rejected the idea and suggested that copies be provided subject to a confidentiality agreement that the Staff itself agreed could not be enforced (Attachment L).

After a meeting with CGC's counsel, the Staff elected to review the invoices at the office of counsel for CGC rather than debate the appropriateness of a protective order

or pursue another method of protecting the confidentiality of the documents.. CGC allowed the Staff to review unredacted copies of the invoices and did not restrict the amount of time that Staff could have access to the data. CGC stood prepared to take the necessary steps to allow the Staff to review and analyze these documents on government premises, but could only do so with appropriate safeguards in place that would not violate its obligation to protect third party proprietary data. If additional time was needed by the Staff, the Company would have agreed to another extension of the date for completion of the audit as it had in response to the Staff's previous two requests for additional time. When the Staff's representatives finished their review of the documents at CGC's counsel's office, they did not indicate that the review and analysis was incomplete. After completing the review at the counsel's office, the Staff did not communicate a need for a more thorough review of the invoices until the final Report was provided on June 4, 2004. While the Staff had provided a draft of its findings on May 24, 2004, the discussion of the alleged scope limitation was not provided until the final report was issued. Until the report was received, CGC believed that the Staff was satisfied with the arrangement to review the documents at the counsel's office. It was the Staff that alleged that a Protective Order would be inappropriate, and the Staff that did not complete the necessary analysis when the documents were provided at CGC's counsel's office Any inability to retain the documents, or to have sufficient time for review and/or analysis of the documents, was a result of Staff's actions, not CGC's.

CGC will continue to work with the Staff to ensure that it has the information it requires, subject to appropriate procedures for protecting the confidentiality of the documents.

### **CONCLUSION**

The facts are simple and undisputed. CGC informed the Staff of the Agreement in 2001, referred to the Agreement and identified the payment in filings to implement IMCR credits that were in periods that have previously been audited by the Staff. The Staff never indicated it had any problem with this arrangement. Moreover, CGC terminated the Agreement on its own initiative as soon as it determined that changing market conditions necessitated a new arrangement in order to maximize gain for ratepayers. As such, Staff's Recommendation #1 to impose sanctions and/or penalties for failure to maintain records is completely unwarranted and should be denied. The bailment was an off-system sale provided for under the IMCR tariff provision in effect prior to January 1, 2003, and CGC's customers received the proper credit for the period that the Agreement was in effect In addition, due to the nature of the bailment agreement and Staff's failure to indicate it had any problem with this arrangement, neither Sequent nor CGC maintained records that could be used to calculate the revenue generated from Sequent's use of CGC's assets during January 2002-December 2002. However, CGC has clearly established that the bailment fee was appropriate and reasonable under the current market conditions at the time. Therefore, Recommendation #2 to require CGC to recalculate the IMCR credits for January 2002 - December 2002 should also be denied. Finally, CGC will continue to monitor the market and is committed to ensuring that the asset management arrangement remains in the best interest of it ratepayers.

# VERIFICATION

STATE OF TENNESSEE )
COUNTY OF HAMILTON )

I, Steven L. Lindsey, being duly sworn state that I am the Vice President — Operations of Chattanooga Gas Company, that I am authorized to make this verification of behalf of Chattanooga Gas Company; that I have read the foregoing Response of Chattanooga Gas Company to the Energy and Water Division's Compliance Audit Report in Docket No. 03-00516 and know the content thereof, that the same is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Steven L. Lindsey

Sworn and subscribed before me this 9% day of July, 2004

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: March 25, 2006



### **List of Attachments**

- Attachment A- Deloitte & Touche Letter
- Attachment B- March 25, 2002 IMCR Filing
- Attachment C- May 27, 2003 IMCR Filing
- Attachment D- Interruptible Margin Credit Rider Effective January 1, 2003 Tariff Sheet 48
- Attachment E- Letter from Staff approving the Interruptible Margin Credit Rider Effective January 1, 2003, Tariff Sheet 48
- Attachment F- Staff Audit of Nashville Gas Company's Incentive Plant Account (IPA)
- Attachment G- March 26, 2002 Letter from Staff acknowledging receipt of February 28, 2002 IMCR filing
- Attachment H- E-mail and June 30, 2003 Data Request relative to the Revised ... IMCR tariff filing
- Attachment I- CGC's Response to Staff's June 30, Data Request
- Attachment J- CGC Tariff Sheet 56 Performance-Based Ratemaking (PBR)
- Attachment K- E-mail form Pat Murphy- indicating agreement for Protective Order
- Attachment L- E-mail from Pat Murphy- Rejecting Protective Order proposal and proposing confidentiality agreement
- Attachment M- November 17, 2000 ACA, Supplier Refund, and IMCR filing
- Attachment N- Computation of average Off-System sale credit June 1998-April 2001
- Attachment O- Comparison of VNG and AGLC Sharing with CGC for 2002 and 2003
- Attachment P- Hal Novak June 23, 2004 Memorandum Notice of Conflict

# Attachment A

9/02 09 07 FAX 404 584 4909

CITC FOR

BETH WHITE

Ø001

Delonte & Tourhe Lijp Juite 1600 Chase Tower 2200 Ross Avenue Dallas Texas 75201 6778

Tel (214) 840 7000 www.us.deloate.com

June 14 2001

Deloitte & Touche

Mr Richard Q'Brien Chief Financial Officer AGL Resources PO Box 4569 Atlanta GA 30302

Dear Mr O'Brien

Deloitte & Touche LLP ("D&T") has completed certain consulting services for the Chattanooga Gas Company ("CGC") in connection with CGC's efforts to complete a bailment agreement with Sequent Energy Management ("Sequent"), pursuant to our engagement letter dated May 25, 2001 This letter represents our report on the services

# Background

As discussed in the aforementioned engagement letter, Deloitte & Touche performed a set of procedures agreed-upon with CGC, subject to a number of underlying assumptions, all of which were discussed at length with, and approved by, CGC Data reviewed included

- Asset volume
- Asset utilization assumptions
- Price curve data

Data used in the calculation process was provided by CGC and/or Sequent personnel Where data was provided by Sequent. CGC has reviewed the data for accuracy and approved its use in this engagement. The personnel involved in the gathering of data and/or review of agreedupon procedures and assumptions throughout this engagement were as follows

CGC Personnel Sue McLaughlin Richard Rogers Robert Stallings Ernie Brake Steve Moore

Sequent Personnel George Grey Brad Freeman

AGLR Personnel Richard O'Brien Beth White Mark Caudill

AGLS Personnel Suzanne Sitherwood Katrına Odom

The analysis was to provide information to CGC that, along with other considerations outside this engagement would assist CGC in the determination of the reasonable fees to be paid CGC by Sequent under the terms of the bailment agreement. As such the procedures were performed, incorporating the approved data and assumptions and were completed on June

Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu BETH WHITE

Ø1002

9/02 09.07 FAX 404 584 4909 AGL Resources

June 14 2001

Page 2 of 2

# Results

The analysis and calculations resulted in an estimate of a market value rate for the use of the CGC assets included within the bailment agreement consistent with CGC's original figure of USD \$300,000 for the first year of the agreement, stipulated as May 1, 2001 – April 30, 2002

# Additional Considerations

As contained in the bailment agreement, the estimated value rate for the use of the assets is to be reviewed each year by CGC to determine if the fee paid CGC by Sequent is appropriate. As this is the first year of the agreement, assumptions as to the utilization of the assets had to be developed by CGC and Sequent without representative history being available to quantitatively and/or qualitatively support planned utilization assumptions. Accordingly, it is likely the methodology utilized in connection with future annual evaluations will include historical utilization information in the determination of adjustments to market value rates for the assets subject to the bailment

Yours truly

Doboite a Touche LLP

Deloitte & Touche LLP By H Joe Wells, Partner

cc Ms. Susan McLaughlin

# Attachment B



Chattanooga Gas Company / 6125 Preservation Drive/ Chattanooga TN 37416

March 25, 2002

Amended Fring

Mr Pat Murphy Tennessee Regulatory Authority Energy and Water Division 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 372430-0505

Dear Ms Murphy,

5

1

Pursuant to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority's Rules and Regulations, Chattanooga Gas Company, or the "Company", hereby files two (2) amended copies of the following revisions to Chattanooga Gas Tariff No 1

Seventieth Revised Sheet No 53 Sixty-Eighth Revised Sheet No 55

We propose an effective date of April 1, 2002 The net cost of gas filed herein reflects the Company's anticipated cost of natural gas for the month of April The Company proposes to use a price of \$4 42/mcf for gas costs which reflects the approximate WACOG storage gas costs that the Company projects as the primary supply for the month of April 2002 Higher withdrawals from the Company's storage are necessary to manage cost and to replace storage gas with lower gas costs for future benefit to the Company's ratepayers Additionally, the Company's deferred gas account is currently in a considerable under-collection position and the Company wants to avoid any further undercollections for the remaining ACA year

This filing also contains the Company's refund of 50% of the total value earned through Off-System Sales from October 1, 2000 through April 30, 2001 in the amount of \$275,140 92. The detail of the Off-System Sales calculation is provided in Attachment A. Historically, this filing has taken place within 60 days of the close of the Company's fiscal year. However, effective October 1, 2001, the Company changed its reporting form a fiscal year ending September 30, to a calendar year basis. Because of this change, the Off-system Sales Report which was previously filed by November 30, has been delayed until now to coincide with the 60 day requirement. As a result we have also extended the time period on which interest on refunds due to customers is calculated

In addition, effective May 1, 2001, the Company entered into an Asset Management Agreement with its affiliate, Sequent Energy Management, L P Under the Asset Management Agreement, the Company assigns its firm pipeline capacity, storage, and supply rights to the Asset Manager in exchange for an annual fee of \$300,000 to be paid in equal monthly payments of \$25,000 per

Page 2 Ms Pat Murphy March 25, 2002

month The Company asserts that the annual payment received from the asset manager is approximately 50% greater than the amount credited to the customers for the twelve months ended June 2000, and 200% greater than that for the twelve months ended June 1999 for Off-system Sales Even though the gas supply assets have been assigned to the Asset Manager, the Company still retains the right to call on the gas supply from the asset manager for its city gate needs

consistent with its rights as they existed prior to their assignment to the asset manager. The Asset Manager's monthly payment is solely for the value acquired for utilization of the released assets when they are <u>not</u> needed by the Company

Because the Company has entered into an agreement with an affiliate to manage its un-utilized capacity and storage assets, we also contracted with the accounting firm of Deloitte and Touche ("D&T") for the purpose of performing an independent valuation on the Asset Management Agreement D&T's valuation report affirms that the \$300,000 annual fee paid to the Company is consistent with the market value for the use of these assets A copy of D&T's valuation report, as well as D&T's memorandum of services to be performed, is attached to this filing. This filing therefore includes \$200,000 from the Asset Management fees for the period of May 1, 2001 through December 31, 2001 as detailed in Attachment B

A total of the Off-system Sales revenues, Asset Management fees, and accrued interest through December 1, 2001 is itemized on page 14 of this PGA filing. Additionally, the refund includes an IMCR balance from the prior 99-00 IMCR refund that was discontinued in November 2001. This outstanding balance has been added to this filing and is itemized on Page 13.

Should there be any questions, I will be please to discuss this filing in further detail with you

Earl Burton P E

Manager of Rates/Marketing

CC

Mr Dan McCormac

Mr Archie Hickerson

Ms Amanda Hwang

Mr Hal Novak

Ms Felicia McKinley

Mr Russell T Perkins

# Chattanooga Gas Company Off-System Sales

# Attachment A

Year	Month	Valume	Revenue	Cost	Profit	Customer Share
2000	Adj 09/00	(1,000)	(4,797 50)	(4,757 06)	(40 44)	(20 22)
	October	8,215	44,934 41	44,512 53	421 88	210 94
	November	301,969	1,441,601 42	1,400,442 57	41,158 85	20,579 42
	December	86,632	578,000 24	509,981 66	68,018 58	34,009 29
0004	Adj 12/00			2,183 00	(2, 183 00)	(1,091 50)
2001	January	37,635	416,996 27	380,411 35	36,584 92	18,292 46
	February	204,425	1,361,490 71	1,173,541 28	187,949 43	93,974 72
	March	229,321	1,242,677 78	1,031,720 37	210,957 41	105,478 71
	April	75,000	421,672 50	414,258 30	7,414 20	3,707 10
			5,502,575 83	4,952,294 00	550,281 83	275,140 92

# Chattanooga Gas Company Asset Management Fees

# Attachment B

 Year	Month		Asset Mgt Fee		Customer Share
2001	May June July August September October November December	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00 25,000 00
	Total	\$	200,000 00	\$	200,000 00

# COMPUTATION OF PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT TO BECOME EFFECTIVE

April 1, 2002

#### INDEX

1	Computation of Current Cost of Ga

LNG Computation

<u>Page</u>

2

- 3 Detail of Rates for Calculation of Firm Commodity
  - Gas Daily Futures Pricing
- 3b Detail of Rates for Calculation of Interruptible Commodity
- 4 Analysis of Average Storage Costs
- 5 Detail of Pipeline Rates and Surcharges
- 6 Computation of Purchased Gas Adjustment and Allocation to Rate Classes
- 7 Tanff Sheet No 53
   Current Level of Purchased Gas Adjustment
- 8 Tariff Sheet No 55
   Current Level of Surcharges and Refund Credits
- 9 Schedule of Sales by Rate Class
- 10 Computation of Adjusted Pipeline Purchases and Average BTU Adjustment
- 11 Revised Individual Tanff Summary Base Margin Rate (11-1-98) and Current Cumulative PGA, Refunds and Surcharges (03-1-02)
- 12 Allocation of IMCR refund refund to rate classifications
- 13 IMCR Refund Balance from Prior IMCR refund
- 14 Off System Sales Revenue/Managment Fee Revenue
- 15 D&T Valuation and Agreement

Filed March 1, 2002

CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY
COMPUTATION OF CURRENT COST OF GAS
BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDED
PGA Filing Effective Date April 1 2002

Dec 31 2001

FIRM COST (D)

Supplier	Current <u>Rate</u>	Total Volume .DT	Monthly Charge	Number of Months	Gas Cost
TENNESSEE					
FT Reservation Charge	\$5 61000	39 792	\$223 233	12	\$2 678,796
FS Storage - Production Area - Deliverability	\$2 02000	13 659	\$27 591	12	\$331 092
FS Storage - Production Area - Space	\$0 02480	2 042 390	\$50 651	12	\$607 812
FS Storage - Market Area - Deliverability	\$1 17000	7 741	\$9 057	12	\$103 684
FS Storage - Market Area - Space	\$0 01870	852 287	\$15 938	12	\$191 256
EAST TENNESSEE					
FT-A Demand	\$7 39000	46 350	\$342 527	12	\$4 110 324
CNG GSS Storage - Demand	\$0 00000	0	\$0	0	\$0
CNG GSS Storage - Capacity	\$0 00000	0	\$0	0	\$0 \$0
Note (Contract for CNG storage cancelled)		_	40		40
SOUTHERN					
FT Reservation Charge	\$11 28470	13 221	\$149 195	12	\$1 790 340
FT-NN Reservation Charge	\$11 28470	14 346	\$161 890	12	\$1 790 340 \$1 942.680
CSS Storage - Deliverability	\$1 54400	14 346	\$22 150	12	\$265.800
CSS Storage - Capacity	\$0 02834	710 484	\$20 135	12	\$241 620
TOTAL FIRM COST					\$12,268 404

### COMMODITY COST (P)

- •						
Supplier		Current <u>Rate</u>	Annual <u>MCF</u>	Company <u>Use</u>	Total MCF Available	Current Annual Gas Cost
EAST TENNESSEE						
FT	(a)	\$4 78555	5 032 561	(4 869)	5 027 692	\$24,060 261
FS Storage Injection	(a)(c)	\$4 60708	(1 415 626)	1 370	(1 414 256)	· ·
FS Storage Withdrawal	(a)	\$5 26484	1 087 698	(1 052)	. ,	\$5 721 017
CNG Storage Injection	(a)(c)	\$0 00000	0	(. 002)	000,040	\$5 /21 01/
CNG Storage Withdrawal	(a)	\$0 00000	0	2	0	\$0 \$0
TOTAL EAST TENNESSEE			4 704 633	_	4 700 082	\$23 265 686
SOUTHERN						
FT	(b)	\$5 18642	2 984,552	(2 888)	2 004 664	<b>*</b>
IT and Purchase of End-User Gas	(b)	\$2 30000	253,993	(246)	2,981 664	\$15 464 162
CSS Storage Injection	(b)(c)	\$5 04997	(417 813)	404	253,747	\$583 618
CSS Storage Withdrawal	(b)	\$5 59223	670,350	(649)	(417,409)	(*= :=:  ==: /
TOTAL SOUTHERN	. ,	,	3,491 082	(3 379)	669,701 3,487,703	\$3.745.119 \$17 684 998
LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS					ł	
Liquefaction and Turbine Fuel	(a)	\$4 78555	(1 052 564)		(1 052 564)	(\$5 037 095)
Boiloff and Vaporization	(d)	\$3 60724	<u>375.158</u>		375.158	\$1.353.286
TOTAL LNG			(677 406)		(677 406)	(\$3 683 809)
						•
TOTAL COMMODITY COST Average Commodity Cost Per MCF			7,518 309	(7 930)	7 510 379	\$37,266,875 \$4 96205

**TOTAL COST** 

\$49,535,279

<sup>(</sup>a) 1 023 BTU adjustment included in above ETNG rates

<sup>(</sup>b) 1 128 BTU adjustment included in above SNG rates

<sup>(</sup>c) WACOG of ET and SNG purchases excl transportation rate Detail - page 3

<sup>(</sup>d) Based on LNG "LIFO" Cost / MCF Detail - page 2

Page 2

DETAIL OF RATES USED TO COMPUTE PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT EFFECTIVE

April 1 2002

MCF VOLUMES FOR LNG AND COMPANY USE / GAS INTO AND OUT OF LNG PLANT FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDED

Dec 31 2001

IQUEFIED NATURAL GAS

_ Month	MCF Liquetier (Into Tank)	Turbine Fuel	ACF Liquefied +Turbine Fuel	-	Turbine Fuel + 6% Tax	Total Cost w/o Tax	Total Cost	Rate	Co Use	Boil-Off	Less Vapor Fuel	Net Port Off	N	Net (To)/From
Jan 01	69 673	0	69,673	\$9 54840		\$665 266	\$665,266		(383)	26 057			Vaponzed	Plant
Feb 01	125,693	0	125 693	\$6 64000		\$834 602	\$834 602		. ,	1	3 252	22 805	108 399	61,531
Mar 01	0	0		0000		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			(533)	25 584	0	25 584	0	(100, 109)
Apr 01	=	0	Ū			\$0	\$0		(528)	21 757	0	21 757	4 174	25 931
•		_	•			\$0	\$0		(441)	12 367	0	12 367	0	12,367
May 01		0	0			\$0	\$0		(1 042)	15 397	0	15 397	-	
Jur⊷ 01	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(610)	15 362	_		0	15 397
Jul 01	0	0	0	\$0 00000	\$0 00000		\$0			1 -	0	15 362	0	15 362
Aug 01	15 994	19 726	35 720	\$3 62000	\$3 83720	**			(768)	16 <b>83</b> 6	0	16 836	0	16 836
Sep 01	0	0	00.20						(744)	20 145	0	20 145	0	(15 575)
			0	\$4 62000	\$4 89720	\$0	\$0		(753)	14 870	0	14 870	0	14 870
Oct 01	504 924	0	504 924	\$1 86000	\$1 97160	\$939 159	\$939 159		(559)	33 106	0	33 106	_	-
Nov 01	316 554	0	316 554	\$3 20200		\$1 013 606	\$1,013,606		. ,	1			0	(471,818)
Dec 01	0	0	0	\$2 54600		\$0			(832)	33 869	0	33 869	0	(282 685)
TOTAL	1 032 838	19 726		\$3 40306	\$2.00704		\$0		(737)	32 754	2 760	29 994	493	30 487
		, 20	1,032,304	WO 40306	\$3 60724	\$3 581 938	\$3 586 223	\$3 60724	(7 930)	268 104	6 012	262 092	113 066	(677 406)

Oct and November 2001 LNG hauled in from F

CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY DETAIL OF RATES USED TO COMPUTE PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT **EFFECTIVE** April 1, 2002

·	φ. π. τ, 2002		
TENNESSEE NATURAL GAS COMPANY			
	DT	RATE	TOTAL
FIRM TRANSPORTATION (FT)			
Reservation Charges - Supplier 1	205,808	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 2	425,326	\$0 01000	\$4,253
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
TGP Commodity - Supplier 1	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 2	433,721	\$4 42000	\$1,917,047
SPOT Commodity - Supplier 1	16,549	\$4 42000	\$73,147
Supplier 2	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Total	450,270	\$4 42945	\$1,994,447
TGP Fuel	(7,655)		
TGP Transport	442 615	\$0 06211	\$27,491
Total TGP	442,615	\$4 56816	\$2,021,938
ET - Supplier 1 - Reservation Charges	4,978	\$7 E8000	
ET - Supplier 1 - Commodity	154,318	\$7 58000	\$37,733
Total	154,318	\$4 42000	\$682,086
Total TGP and ET	596,933	¢4.50207	\$719,819
ETN Fuel	(9,432)	\$4 59307	\$2,741,757
ETN Transport	587,502	\$0.04000	
Rate/MMBTU	587,502 587,502	\$0 01080 \$4 67761	\$6,345
Rate/MCF	307,302	\$4 67761 \$4 78555	\$2,748,102
		<b>94</b> / 6555	
FS STORAGE INJECTION			
Total Purchases	450,270	\$4 42945	\$1,994,447
Fuel	(6,709)	İ	¥ 1,= 2 1, 1 1 1
Injection Charge	443,561	\$0 00672	\$2,981
Rate/MMBTU	443,561	\$4 50316	\$1,997,428
Rate/MCF		\$4 60708	
SOUTHERN NATURAL GAS COMPANY			
	DT	RATE	TOTAL
FIRM TRANSPORTATION (FT)		1	TOTAL
Reservation Charges - Supplier 1	312,117	\$0 01500	\$4,682
Supplier 2	0	\$0 01000	\$0
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Commodity - Supplier 1	318,277	\$4 42000	\$1,406,784
Supplier 2	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Total	318,277	\$4 43471	\$1,411,466
Fuel	(8,275)		41,711,100
Transport	310,002	\$0 04280	\$13,268
Rate/MMBTU	310,002	\$4 59589	\$1,424,734
Rate/MCF		\$5 18642	
CSS STORAGE INJECTION			
Total Purchases	249 077		_
Fuel @ 76%	318,277	\$4 43471	\$1,411,466
Injection Charge	(2,419)	00.0000	
Deta/MADTH	315,858	\$0 00630	\$1,990

315,858

Rate/MMBTU

Rate/MCF

\$4 47497

\$5 04997

\$1,413,456

Consolidated Storage Levels

7.	Feb-04 Mar 04	FY04	_,	Dec 03	) N	- C	9	2 6		٠ ۾	Maj				n c		3		De	- Z	<u> </u>		Ą	<u>-</u>	<u>۔</u>	- Ma				2	FY02			_
Total	Jan-04 -3 236,054 Feb-04 War 04	_	Totar			_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	3	+		_				Aug 02 1.	_					_		-2	andle H	L	_
	36,054			3,834,428	4 267,344	4,257,344	3, 787, 344	07,745	2,827,945	2,348,145	1,868,346	1,831,812	2,023,399	00,000	3,0//,124				3.556.090	3,747,677	3,103,869	2,435,829	1,721,750	1,410,665	1,507,325	1,817,325	2,187,891	3,142,822	3,703,839	1		Cginning Volume		Œ
	\$3 86			\$3 80	\$3 75	\$3.75	\$3 79	\$3.83	\$3 89	\$3 98	\$4 13	\$4 14	\$4 07	94 54	83 84	•			\$3.78	\$3 76	\$3 89	\$4 13	\$4 55	\$4 87	\$4 87	\$4 72	\$4 75	\$4 69	\$4 42			WACOG	,	Beginning Inventory
	\$12 498,044			\$14,570,148	\$16,015,616	\$16,015,616	\$14,341,116	\$12,666,615	\$11 001,711	\$9,351,200	\$7,712,685	\$7,588,212	\$8,239,700	39,868,411	\$11,822,865			610,101,070	\$13 451 576	\$14 103 084	\$12.075.068	\$10.054.247	\$7,826,322	\$6,872,847	\$7,333,394	\$8,569,237	\$10,400,894	\$14,748,571	\$17,349,692			Total Cost Beginning Inventory	٠	nventory
62 329	62,329		2,555,429	76,982	42,915		479,800	479,800	479,800	479,800	479,800	36,534					2,002,041	3 883 044		0,000	843 808	668.040	714,079	311.085	128.010		191,434		5,585			Net Injections		Inic
\$246,823	\$246,823	100,000,000	\$8,886,464	\$299 845	\$159.215	\$0	\$1,674,501	\$1,674,501	\$1,664,905	\$1 650 511	\$1,638,516	\$124,472	\$0	\$0	\$0		36,788,687	3 400	• 6 • 6	62,027,333	80,070,07	\$2 020 821	\$2 227 425	\$953.478	\$390.431	\$0	\$566,645	\$0	\$11,399			Injection Total Cost Rate Injections		ctions
(609 836)	(609,836)	(2,000,400)	(3,398,499)	(675.356)	(475.831)								(191,587)	(478,966)	(574,759)		(3,288,756)	(478,966)	(191,587)					(227,070)	(224 670)	(310,000)	(562,000)	(954 931)	(566,602)		dia siletta e	Net W/	STEAR INTIL 44	L. deith
(\$2.156.342)	(\$2,156,342)	(\$6,211,285)	(\$2,3/1,949)	(\$1,004,003)	(\$1.604.683)	ŝ	5 6	S 6	÷ 6	2 6	2 2	30,700/	(\$851.488)	(\$1.628.711)	(\$1,954,454)		(\$13,725,518)	(\$1,628,711)	(\$651,488)	\$0	80	9 6	9 6	(9000,978)	(\$850 030)	(\$1,000,002)	(\$2.368.303)	(373 575)	(\$0.510.500)			WACOG Total Cost  Rate Withdraws 1	awais	
•	SO	\$0	\$0	. \$0	\$0	<b>9</b> C	9 6	» &C	\$ \$ \$	. \$0	9 9	» «c	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		r O		\$0	\$0	. \$0	. 50	- \$0	\$0	- \$0	50	. 50		₩0	90			WAIR WHOLE WAIR	77	Withdrawals	
	2,688,547		3,236,054	3,834,428	4,267,344	4,267,344	3,787,544	3,307,745	2,827,945	2,348,145	1,868,346	1,831,812	2,023,399	2,502,305	2 500			3.077.124	3.556.090	3,747,677	3,103,869	2,435,829	1,721,750	1,410,665	1,507,325	1,817,325	2,187,891	3,142,822	•		Inventory			
	3 938382		3 862125	3 799823	3 753064	3 753064	3 786389	3 829381		3 982377	4 128082		-	_	,						ω				5 4865171	5 4715302	1 4 753845	2 4 692779		٥			Ending Inventory	
	\$10,588,524	1	\$12,498,044	\$14,570,148	\$16,015,616	\$16,015,616	\$14,341,116	\$12 666,615		-			•		-			\$11,822,885							_	2 \$8,569,237	5 \$10,400,894	9 \$14,748,571			Ending Inventory	G Total Cost	iventory	

j

#### DETAIL OF RATES USED TO COMPUTE INTERRUPTIBLE PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT EFFECTIVE April 1, 2002

# TENNESSEE NATURAL GAS COMPANY

	DT	RATE	TOTAL
INTERRUPTIBLE TRANSPORTATION (IT)			
Reservation Charges - Supplier 1	205,808	\$0 00000	\$o
Supplier 2	425,326	\$0 01000	\$4,253
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
TGP Commodity - Supplier 1	0	\$0,0000	\$0
Supplier 2	433,721	\$4 42000	\$1,917,047
SPOT Commodity - Supplier 1	16,549	\$4 42000	\$73,147
Supplier 2	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 3	0	\$0,0000	\$0
Total	450,270	\$4 42945	\$1,994,447
TGP Fuel	(7,655)	•	<b>\$ 1,551,177</b>
TGP IT Transport	442,615	\$0 26940	\$119,241
Total TGP	442,615	\$4 77545	\$2,113,688
ET - Supplier 1 - Reservation Charges	4,978	\$7 58000	\$27.722
ET - Supplier 1 - Commodity	154,318	\$4 42000	\$37,733
Total	154,318	Ψ1 12000	\$682,086
Total TGP and ET	596,933	\$4 74677	\$719,819
ETN Fuel	(9,432)	Ψ-1-1011	\$2,833,507
ETN INT Transport	587,502	\$0 24780	£445 500
Rate/MMBTU	587,502	\$5 07078	\$145,583
Rate/MCF	00.,002	\$5 07078 \$5 18779	\$2,979,090
		401013	1

# SOUTHERN NATURAL GAS COMPANY

				1
		DT	RATE	TOTAL
INTERRUPTIBLE TR	ANSPORTATION (IT)			IOIAL
Reservation Charge		312,117	\$0 01500	\$4,682
	Supplier 2	0	\$0 01000	\$0
	Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Commodity - Supple	er 1	318,277	\$4 42000	\$1,406,784
Su	pplier 2	0	\$0,00000	\$0
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	pplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Total		318,277	\$4 43471	\$1,411,466
Fuel		(8,275)	<b>V</b> ,	Ψ1,+11,400
SNG INT Transport		310,002	\$0 39780	\$123,319
Rate/MMBTU		310,002	\$4 95089	\$1,534,785
Rate/MCF			\$5 58704	
TOTAL SYSTEM VOL WEIGHTED SYSTEM WEIGHTED SYSTEM	INT RATE/DT	897,504 897,504 874,019	\$5 0294 <b>\$5.1645</b>	\$4,513,875

# CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY ANALYSIS OF AVERAGE STORAGE COST TWELVE MONTHS ENDEC Dec 31, 2001

TGP	FS-PA	/λ//Δ	#30/17	#3999
101	10-	/ IVI/ 1	#12341	# 7999

	MMBtu Inj	Rate	Cost	
Jan 01	162,768	\$10 12543	\$1,648,096	
Feb 01	204,570	\$6 27647	\$1 283,978	
Mar 01	107 087	\$5 17529	\$554,206	
Apr 01	288,042	\$5 53540	\$1 594,427	
May 01	360,569	\$4 88208	\$1,760,326	
June 01	69,733	\$3 72677	\$259,879	
Jul 01	233 874	\$3 25990	\$762,405	
Aug 01	163,220	\$3 26878	\$533,531	
Sep 01	0	\$0 00000	\$0	
Oct 01	0	\$0 00000	\$0	
Nov 01	74,/02	\$2 96414	\$221,427	
Dec 01	23 463	\$2 43444	\$57,119	
	1,688,028	\$5 13937	\$8,675,395	
Withdrawal Cha	rge	\$0 00672		
Rate per MMBtu	I	\$5 14609		
Rate per MCF		\$5 26484		

	ETNG GSS/CNG		SNG CSS			
	MMBtu Inj	Rate	Cost	MMBtu ini		Cost
Jan 01	0		\$0	<del></del>	\$10 11315	\$312,921
Feb 01	0		\$0	34 396	\$6 50183	\$223 637
Mar 01	0		\$0	33,475	\$4 98190	
Apr 01	0		\$0	75,320	\$5 48156	\$166,769 \$442.874
May 01	0		\$0	86,403	\$4 97325	\$412,871
June 01	0		\$0	54 978		\$429,704
Jul 01	0	\$0 00000	\$0	41,261	\$3 80680	\$209,290
Aug 01	0	\$0 00000	\$0	16 831	\$3 25933	\$134,483
Sep 01	0	41 1100	\$0		\$3 28180	\$55,236
Oct 01	0		\$0	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Nov 01	0			6,149	\$1 77403	\$10,908
Dec 01	0		\$0 \$0	70,927	\$4 58947	\$325,517
-	0	\$0,0000	\$0	19,566	\$2 35153	\$46,010
Withdrawal Char	_	\$0 00000	\$0	470,248	\$4 94919	\$2,327,347
	ge	\$0 01470			\$0 00630	
Rate per MMBtu		\$0 01470			\$4 95549	
Rate per MCF		<b>\$</b> 0 01504			\$5 59223	

# CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY DETAIL OF RATES AND SURCHARGES USED TO COMPUTE PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT EFFECTIVE April 1, 2002

TENNESSEE		Tariff	Effective				Tarıff	Effective (
FT-A Demand	Zone 1 - 1	Rate 5 61	Rate	SOUTHERN			Rate	Rate
Total FT-A Demand	2016 1 - 1	301	\$5 61000 \$5 61000	FT Demand GRI	Zone 3		10 79	\$10 79000
- Total Tin Barrana	<del></del>		\$2 6 1000					0 12300
				Southern Energy				0 37170
FT-A Commodity	Zone 0 - 289	% 0 0669	\$0 01873	Total FT Demand				\$11 28470
		% 0 0572	\$0.04118	FT Commodity	D 1 0			
Total FT-A Commodity		75 5 5 5 7 2	0 05991	GSR	Prod - 3		0 0290	\$0 02900
ACA			0 00220	Storage Receiving Surcharge				\$0 0004
GRI			N/A	ACA				\$0 0040
TCSM			0 00000	GRI				0 00220
TCRA			N/A	Total FT Commodity				0 00720
Total FT-A Commod	ity		\$0 06211	rotal i Commodity				\$0 04280
				IT Commodity	Prod - 3		0.2940	<b>F</b> 0 <b>2</b> 0.400
IT Commodity	Zone 1 - 1	0 2672	\$0 26720	GSR	F100 - 3		0 3840	\$0 38400
ACA			0 00220	Storage Receiving Surcharge				\$0 0004
GRI			N/A	ACA				\$0 0040
TCSM			0 00000	GRI				0 00220
TCRA			N/A	Total IT Commodity				0 00720
Total IT Commodity			\$0 26940					\$0 39780
				Southern CSS Storage Service				
EAST TENNESSEE				Injection Charge				0 00630
				Withdrawal Charge				0 00630
FT-A Demand		7 21	\$7 21000	•				0 00030
TCRA (Article 25)			-0 05000	Tennessee FS Storage Service				
GRI (Article 33) (High Loa	ad Factor)		0 23000	FS-PA	67%	71%		
Total FT-A Demand			\$7 39000	Injection Rate			0 0053	
				Withdrawal Rate			0 0053	
FT-A Commodity		0 0011	\$0 00110		ı			
TCRA (Article 25)			0 00000	FS-MA	28%	29%		
GRI (Article 33)			0 00750	Injection Rate			0 0102	
ACA (Article 34)			0 00220	Withdrawal Rate	1		0 0102	
Total FT-A Commodit	У		\$0 01080					
IT Commodity				FS-PA/MA Injection Average		100%		0 00672
GRI (Article 33)		0 2381	\$0 23810	FS-PA/MA Withdrawal Avera	ge			0 00672
ACA (Article 34)			0 00750					
Total IT Commodity			0 00220	CNG GSS Storage Service	5%			
Total Treominodity			\$0 24780	Injection Rate			0 0162	
				Withdrawał Rate			0 0147	
				Tennessee Storage Injection Aver	100%			0 00722

# CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY COMPUTATION OF PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT AND ALLOCATION TO RATE CLASSES BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDEC Dec 31, 2001

RATES TO BE EFFECTIVE

April 1, 2002

D	Monthly Contract	Annual Commodity	CUR	RENT GAS CO	ost
Rate Schedule	Demand	MCF Sales	Demand	Commodity	Total
I-1	9,033	625,370	780,252	2,854,357	3,634,609
L-1		223,253		1.152.991	1,152,991
T-2**	0		0	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	0,102,331
ALL OTHER V-1	133,000	7,286 935	11,488,152	33 259 528	44,747,680
otal Cost Adjustment	142,033	8,135,558	\$12,268,404	\$37,266,875	\$49,535,279

CURRENT LEVEL OF GAS CUST/MCF (D) mand (D) (P) r Unit Demand Commodity Total 7 1981 4 5643 4 5643 5 1645 5 1645 7 1981 1 5765 4 5643 6 1408 0 2366 4 5643 4 8009

100% LOAD FACTOR DEMAND COST/MCF

<sup>\*</sup> Total Demand Cost = Total Firm Cost / 142033 X 365 Da \$0 2366

\* Unit Cost basec 108,397 annual contract demand units

<sup>\*\*</sup> All Demand Units for I-1/T-2 Customers are billed under the I-1 rate

### TRA NO 1

### CURRENT LEVEL OF PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT (IN DOLLARS PER MCF)

#### RATE TARIFF

1						
Effective Date	I-1 Demand	I-1 Commodity	* L-1 Commodity	T-2 Demand	V-1 Commodity All C	Other Commodity
BASE RATES	\$15 0861	\$2 2751	\$2 2751	\$15 0861	\$2 7710	\$3 5120
11-01-99	<b>60</b> 4000					
12-01-99	\$0 1000	\$0 3000	\$0 3000	\$0 1000	\$0 1000	\$0 3000
1-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
1	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0,0000
2-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
3-01-99	\$0,0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0,0000
4-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0,000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
5-01-99	(\$0 1514)	(\$0 6033)	(\$0 6033)	(\$0 1514)	(\$0 4050)	(\$0 3800)
6-01-99	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0,0000
7-01-99	\$0 0016	\$0 2599	\$0 2599	\$0 0016	\$0 2600	\$0 2440
8-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0,000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
9-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 5374	\$0 5374	\$0 0000	\$0 5370	\$0 6570
10-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 2563	\$0 8115	\$0,0000	\$0 2540	\$0 2543
11-01-99	(\$7 7316)	(\$0 1037)	(\$0 0633)	(\$7 7316)	(\$0 3551)	\$0 2343 \$0 0287
12-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 2281	\$0 3886	\$0,0000	\$0 2281	\$0 0287 \$0 2279
1-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	
2-01-00	\$0 0000	(\$0 5599)	(\$0 9017)	\$0,0000	(\$0 5599)	\$0 0000
3-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	(\$0 5599)
4-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 3488	\$0 2618	\$0 0000	\$0 3488	\$0 0000
5-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 3957
6-01-00	(\$0 0602)	\$0 1691	\$0 4842	(\$0 0602)	\$0 0000 \$0 1671	\$0 0000
7-01-00	(\$0 0464)	\$0 9174	\$1 4861	(\$0 0464)	\$0 9174	\$0 0908
8-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 9419
9-01-00	\$0 0000	(\$0 3497)	(\$0 6810)	\$0 0000	(\$0 3497)	\$0 0000
10-01-00	\$0,000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	(\$0 3783)
11-01-00	\$0 0000	\$1 3896	\$1 6936	\$0,0000	\$1 3896	\$0 0000
12-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 9011	\$0 3706	\$0 0000	\$0 9011	\$1 3896
01-01-01	\$0,0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 9093
02-01-01	\$0 0000	\$2 4344	\$3 6829	\$0 0000	\$2 4344	\$0 0000
03-01-01	\$0 0000	(\$2 1848)	(\$3 3260)	\$0 0000	\$2 4344 (\$2 1848)	\$2 3090
04-01-01	\$0 0000	(\$0 9978)	(\$1 0971)	\$0 0000	(\$0 9978)	(\$2 1848)
05-01-01	\$0 0000	(\$0 2005)	\$0 3759	\$0 0000	(\$0 2005)	(\$1 1168)
06-01-01	\$0,0000	(\$0 2283)	(\$0 5416)	\$0 0000	(\$0 2283)	(\$0 2048)
07-01-01	\$0 0000	(\$0 8485)	(\$1 1932)	\$0 0000	(\$0 8485)	(\$0 2469)
08-01-01	\$0 0000	(\$0 3493)	(\$0 5596)	\$0,0000	` '	(\$0 8893)
09-01-01	\$0 0000	\$0 0902	\$0 0169	\$0 0000	(\$0 3493)	(\$0 3436)
10-01-01	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0902	\$0 0950
11-01-01	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0,0000	\$0,0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000
12-01-01	\$0 0000	(\$0 3232)	\$0 0454	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
01-01-01	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	(\$0 3248)	(\$0 3433)
02-01-01	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
03-01-01	\$0 0000	(\$0 6574)	(\$1 3347)		\$0 0000	\$0 0000
04-01-01	\$0 0000	\$1 8633	\$2 4761	\$0,0000	(\$0 6574)	(\$0 5352)
		4. 5555	ΨZ 4701	\$0 0000	\$1 8633	\$1 9685
Current Cost	\$7 1981	\$4 5643	\$5 1645	\$7 1981	\$4 8009	\$6 1408

\*NOTE

The L-1 commodity rate shall also be applicable to the air conditioning rate for rate schedules R-1 R-4 AND C-1

#### CURRENT LEVEL OF SURCHARGES AND REFUND CREDITS

## AMOUNTS INDICATED BELOW APPLY TO THE BILLING DETERMINANTS OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TARIFF

RATES Billing Unit	I-1 Demand MCF	I-1 Commodity MCF	L-1 Commodity MCF	T-1 Commodity MCF	T-2 Demand MCF	T-2 Commodity MCF	All Other CCF	A/C CCF	V-1 CCF
Supplier Refund 99-00*	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
ACA Refund 99-00**	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
MCR Refund 00-01****	(\$0 2368)	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	(\$0 0051)	(\$0 0051)	\$0 0000
2002 GSR Refund *****	(\$0 3592)	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	(\$0 3592)	\$0 0000	(\$0 0133)	(\$0 0133)	(\$0 0133)
ACA Refund 00-01	(\$1 5293)	\$0 4394	<b>\$0</b> 4394	\$0 0000	(\$1 5293)	\$0 0000	\$0 0153	\$0 0153	\$0 0000
TOTAL	(\$2 1253)	<b>\$0 4394</b>	<b>\$0 4394</b>	\$0 0000	(\$1 8885)	\$0 0000	(\$0 0031)	(\$0 0031)	(\$0 0133)

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>IMCR refund made effective April 1 2002 for a period of 12 months or longer as may be required to refund IMCR balance

<sup>\*\*\*\*\*\*</sup>GSR surcharge made effective for March 1 2002 for a period of two months to refund outstanding balance balance will be applied to the next ACA filing

<sup>\*</sup>Supplier refund made effective December 1 2000 discontinued on December 1 2001 Outstanding balance will be applied to next supplier refund

<sup>\*\*</sup>ACA 99-00 surcharge made effective December 1 2000 discontinued on December 1 2001 Outstanding balance will be applied to future ACA filing

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>ACA 00-01 surcharge made effective December 1 2001 for a period of 12 months or shorter as may be required to collect PGA under-recovery See itemized breakdown of collection items

# CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY MCF SALES BY RATE CLASS AND OFF-SYSTEM REVENUE CREDIT ESTIMATE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED Dec 31, 2001

June 01

Jul 01

Aug 01

Sep 01

Oct 01

Nov 01

Dec 01

TOTAL

84,757

74,298

66,804

76,947

118,667

266,373

339,115

3,566,704

1,031

1,043

1,104

1,577

1,927

2,783

22,378

980

Mont	1.4					
Mor'n	I-1	<u>1</u>	All Other	TOTAL	T-1 & T-2	TOTAL
Jan 01	46,433	12,758	1,328,273	1,387,164	749,807	2,137,271
Feb 01	59,793	15,669	1,443,432	1,518,894	117,354	1,636,248
Mar 01	59,299	23,490	968,625	1,051,414	813,266	1,864,680
Aor 01	129,979	38,282	845,796	1,014,057	556,970	1,571,027
May 01	58,791	19,640	362,675	441,106	689,281	1,130,387
June 01	45,144	11,585	240,333	297,062	704,845	1,001,907
Jul 01	32,500	6,921	226,860	266,281	687,038	953,319
Aug 01	47,816	24,701	201,710	274,227	686,864	961,091
Sep 01	29,354	22,390	219,793	271,537	653,194	
Oct 01	40,003	18,567	285,446	344,016	750,576	924,731
Nov 01	30,071	15,531	514,135	559,737	696,623	1,094,592
Dec 01	46,187	13,719	649,857	709,763		1,256,360
TOTAL	625,370	223,253	7,286,935	8,135,558	671,353	1,381,116
	•		7,200,000	0,135,556	7,777,171	15,912,729
				Off-System		
Month	R - 1	R-4	C - 1	Revenue Credit	T-1*	T-2
Jan 01	755,363	3,477	569,433	\$0.00	632,406	117,401
Feb 01	721,406	3,080	718,946	\$0.00	102,781	
Mar 01	498,908	3,045	466,672	\$0.00		14,573
Apr 01	424,435	1,662	419,699	\$0.00	703,236	110,030
May 01	139,631	669	222,375	\$0 00 \$0 00	542,588	14,382
June 01	84 757	1 024	454.545	<b>\$0.00</b>	602,267	87,014

154,545

151,519

133,926

141,742

165,202

245,835

307,959

3,697,853

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0 00

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

590,420

570,547

571,936

538,693

625,120

575,954

558,505

6,614,453

114,425

116,491

114,928

114,501

125,456

120,669

112,848

1,162,718

Page 10

MCF VOLUMES PURCHASED (BY PIPELINE) AND COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE BTU ADJUSTMENT FOR GAS TRANSPORTED ON EAST TENNESSEE AND SOUTHERN

TWELVE MONTHS ENDED Dec 31, 2001

#### EAST TENNESSEE

FT	ΙT	FS	FS	CNG	CNG		BTU	MMBTU
Purchases	Purchases	inj	W/D	Ini	W/D	TOTAL		
757,776	0	(157,112)	388 626					VOLUMES
463 950	0		•	_	_		-	1,024,904
606.857			•		•	326,367	1 036	338,116
•		` ' '	•	0	0	629,758	1 036	652,429
•	O	(278 032)	38 010	0	0	111,951	1 036	115,981
426,044	0	(345,667)	0	0	0	80.377		83,270
95,198	0	(67,310)	20,427	0	0	,		-
96,895	0	(225 747)	0	_		•		50,054
150 469	0	` ,	_				1 036	(133,490)
-		,	•	_	0	285,725	1 036	296,011
•	-	0	16 224	(13,956)	0	144,954	1 036	150,172
•	0	0	159 145	0	0	620.945	1.036	643 299
771,014	0	(74,702)	0	0	0	•		
707,899	0	(22 648)	236 957	n		,	–	662,628
5,032,561	0					<del></del>		990,399
,	J	(1,415,020)	1 007 098	(13 956)	73,164	4,763,841	1 023	4,873,773
	Purchases 757,776 463 950 606,857 351,973 426,044 95,198 96,895 150 469 142,686 461,800 771,014	Purchases Purchases 757,776 0 463 950 0 606,857 0 351,973 0 426,044 0 95,198 0 96,895 0 150 469 0 142,686 0 461,800 0 771,014 0 707,899 0	Purchases Purchases         Inj           757,776         0         (157,112)           463 950         0         (197,461)           606,857         0         (148,239)           351,973         0         (278 032)           426,044         0         (345,667)           95,198         0         (67,310)           96,895         0         (225 747)           150 469         0         101,292           142,686         0         0           461,800         0         0           771,014         0         (74,702)           707,899         0         (22 648)	Purchases Purchases         Inj         W/D           757,776         0         (157,112)         388,626           463 950         0         (197,461)         23,205           606,857         0         (148,239)         171,140           351,973         0         (278 032)         38 010           426,044         0         (345,667)         0           95,198         0         (67,310)         20,427           96,895         0         (225 747)         0           150 469         0         101,292         33,964           142,686         0         0         16 224           461,800         0         0         159 145           771,014         0         (74,702)         0           707,899         0         (22 648)         236,957	Purchases Purchases         Inj         W/D         Inj           757,776         0         (157,112)         388,626         0           463 950         0         (197,461)         23,205         0           606,857         0         (148,239)         171,140         0           351,973         0         (278 032)         38 010         0           426,044         0         (345,667)         0         0           95,198         0         (67,310)         20,427         0           96,895         0         (225 747)         0         0           150 469         0         101,292         33,964         0           142,686         0         0         16 224         (13,956)           461,800         0         0         159 145         0           771,014         0         (74,702)         0         0           707,899         0         (22 648)         236,957         0	Purchases Purchases         Inj         W/D         Inj         W/D           757,776         0         (157,112)         388,626         0         0           463 950         0         (197,461)         23,205         0         36,673           606,857         0         (148,239)         171,140         0         0           351,973         0         (278 032)         38 010         0         0           426,044         0         (345,667)         0         0         0           95,198         0         (67,310)         20,427         0         0           96,895         0         (225 747)         0         0         0           150 469         0         101,292         33,964         0         0           142,686         0         0         16 224         (13,956)         0           461,800         0         0         159 145         0         0           771,014         0         (74,702)         0         0         0           707,899         0         (22 648)         236,957         0         36,491	Purchases Purchases         Inj         W/D         Inj         W/D         TOTAL           757,776         0         (157,112)         388,626         0         0         989,290           463 950         0         (197,461)         23,205         0         36,673         326,367           606,857         0         (148,239)         171,140         0         0         629,758           351,973         0         (278 032)         38 010         0         0         111,951           426,044         0         (345,667)         0         0         0         80,377           95,198         0         (67,310)         20,427         0         0         48,315           96,895         0         (225 747)         0         0         0         (128,852)           150 469         0         101,292         33,964         0         0         285,725           142,686         0         0         16 224         (13,956)         0         144,954           461,800         0         0         0         0         620,945           771,014         0         (74,702)         0         0         0         696,	Purchases Purchases         Inj         W/D         Inj         W/D         TOTAL         ADJ           757,776         0         (157,112)         388,626         0         0         989,290         1 036           463 950         0         (197,461)         23,205         0         36,673         326,367         1 036           606,857         0         (148,239)         171,140         0         0         629,758         1 036           351,973         0         (278 032)         38 010         0         0         111,951         1 036           426,044         0         (345,667)         0         0         0         80,377         1 036           95,198         0         (67,310)         20,427         0         0         48,315         1 036           96,895         0         (225 747)         0         0         0         (128,852)         1 036           150 469         0         101,292         33,964         0         0         285,725         1 036           142,686         0         0         16 224         (13,956)         0         144,954         1 036           461,800         0         0

#### SOUTHERN

	FT	1/	IT	css	CSS		вти	MMBTU
Month	Purchases	Pur	chases	lnį	W/D	TOTAL		
Jan 01	686,080		21,198	(30,696)	101,991		ADJ	VOLUMES
Feb 01	507,851		16 256	, , ,	•	778,5	73 1 008	784,801
	•			(34,396)	36,298	526,00	9 1008	530,217
Mar 01	235,539		23,437	(33 209)	209,888	435.65	5 1008	•
Apr 01	278,727		14,772	(74,722)	10,736	•		439,140
May 01	125,340	:	31 724	(85,717)	•	229,5	•	230,986
June 01	113,339			, , ,	4,338	75,68	1 008	76,290
	, -		24,528	(54,542)	14,524	97.84	9 1008	98,632
Jul 01	55,071		35,652	(40 933)	18,401	68 19		•
Aug 01	93,992	2	20,619	(16,831)	39,212			68,736
Sep 01	87,535	-	20,707		•	136,99	2 1 008	138,087
Oct 01	•		•	0	100	108,34	2 1008	109,208
	138,971	Ī	15,440	(6,149)	89,643	237,90	5 1008	239,808
Nov 01	399,155	2	29,660	(21,207)	11,861	•		-
Dec 01	262,952		0	(19 411)	133 358	419,46		422,824
TOTAL	2,984,552	25	3.993			376,89	9 2 125	800 926
	2,004,002	20	3,393	(417,813)	670,350	3,491,08	2 1 128	3,939,655

TOTAL MCF PURCHASES

8,254,923

<sup>1/</sup> Includes enduser cashout purchases

REFUNDS & BILLING BASE RATE PGA SURCHARGES RATE WINTER (NOV - APR) Festenbal Base Lise Charge/Jill \$7 5000 \$7 5000 General Service First 25 CCF \$0 2900 \$0.6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 9010 Next 25 CCF \$0 2000 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0.8110 Over 50 CCF \$0 1750 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 7860 SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Base Use Chargs/Bill \$7 5000 \$7 5000 First 25 CCF \$0 2100 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 8210 Next 25 CCF \$0 1500 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 7610 Over 50 CCF \$0 0450 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 6560 Air Canditioning SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Over 50 CCF \$0,0450 \$0 4564 (\$0 0031) \$0 4983 Standby Service Rate Per CCF of Input per Mont Demand Charge \$0 3000 \$0 7198 (\$0 2125)\$0 8073 WINTER (NOV APR) Multi Family Base Use Charge/Unit \$6,0000 \$6 0000 Housing Service Commodity Charge/CCF \$0 1800 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 7910 SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Base Use Charge/Bill \$6 0000 \$6 0000 Commodity Charge/CCF \$0 1600 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 7710 Air Conditioning SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Flat Rate / CCF \$0 0450 \$0 4564 (\$0.0031)\$0 4983 WINTER (NOV - APR) Commercial & Industrial Base Use Charge/Bill \$20 0000 \$20 0000 General Service First 3 000 CCF \$0 2750 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0.8860 Next 2 000 CCF 0 2510 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 8620 Next 10 000 CCF 0 2445 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 8555 Over 15 000 CCF 0 1265 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 7375 SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Base Use Charge/Bill \$15 0000 \$15 0000 First 3 000 CCF \$0 2159 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0.8269 Next 2 000 CCF 0 1714 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 7824 Next 10 000 CCF 0 1598 \$0 6141  $(\$0\ 0031)$ \$0 7708 Over 15 000 CCF 0 1265 \$0 6141 (\$0 0031) \$0 7375 Air Conditioning SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Flat Rate / CCF \$0 0450 \$0 4564 (\$0 0031) \$0 4983 Standby Service Demand Charge Rate Per CCF of Input per Mont \$0 3000 \$0 7198 (\$0 2125) \$0 8073 11 Base Use Charge \$300 0000 \$300 0000 Large Volume Demand Charge / Demand Unit \$3 0000 \$7 1981 (\$2,1253) \$8 0728 Firm Service Commodity Charge / MCF First 1 500 MCF \$0 8888 \$4 5643 \$0 4394 \$5 8925 Next 2500 MCF \$0 7598 \$4 5643 \$0 4394 \$5 7635 Next 11 000 MCF \$0 4312 \$4 5643 \$0 4394 \$5 4349 Over 15 000 MCF \$0 2650 \$4 5643 \$0 4394 \$5 2687 L 1 Base Use Charge \$300 0000 \$300 0000 Interruptible Service Commodity Charge/MCF First 1 500 MCF \$0 8888 \$5 1645 \$0 4394 \$6 4927 Next 2,500 MCF \$0.7598 \$5 1645 \$0 4394 \$6 3637 Next 11 000 MCF \$0 4312 \$5 1645 \$0 4394 \$6 0351 Over 15 000 MCF \$0 2650 \$5 1645 \$0 4394 \$5 8689 T 1 Customer Charge \$300 0000 \$300 0000 Interruptible Transportation Transportation Charge/MCF Service First 1 500 MCF \$0 BBBB \$0,0000 \$0 8888 Next 2 500 MCF \$0 7598 \$0,000 \$0 7598 Next 11 000 MCF \$0 4312 \$0 0000 \$0 4312 Over 15 000 MCF \$0 2650 \$0 0000 \$0 2650 T 2 Customer Charge \$300 0000 \$300 0000 Interruptible Transportation Demand Charge/Demand Unit \$3 0000 \$7 1981 (\$1 8885) \$8 3096 Service with Firm Backup Transportation Charge/MCF First 1 500 MCF \$0 8888 \$0,0000 \$0 8888 Next 2 500 MCF \$0 7598 \$0 0000 \$0 7598 Next 11 000 MCE \$0 4312 \$0 0000 \$0 4312 Over 15 000 MCF \$0 2650 \$0 0000 \$0 2650 Natural Gas Vehicle Base Use Charge / Bill \$17 5000 \$17 5000 Service Flat Rate / CCF \$0 0450 \$0 4801 (\$0 0133) \$0 5118

CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY REFUND EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2002

1

ALLOCATION OF IMCR REFUND TO RATE CLASS CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDING DEC 31, 2001

	Contract	Annual Commodity				Demand				
Rate Schedule	Demand	Mcf Sales	Demand	Commodity	Total	Per Unit	Demand	Commodity		Total
-	9,033	625,370 \$	(25,667)		(25.667) \$	(0 2368)	€9	•	49	(\$/mcf)
Ξ		223,253 \$		•	•	/	· <del>69</del>	•	· 69	•
T-2		49	•		•					
All Other	130,967	7,286,935 \$	(372,136) \$	<b>ω</b>	(372,136)	<b>69</b>	(0.0511) \$	í	\$	(0 0511)
٧-1		<b>⇔</b>	·	49	•	<b>↔</b>	·	•	↔	
TOTAL	140,000	8,135,558	(397,803)							
DESCRIPTION OF REFUND ITEM	REFUND ITEM	•	Demand	Commodity	Total					
Pnor Year Balance 00-01 IMCR Refund (Off System Sales)	Off System Sales)	\$	104,173 (501,976) \$	<del>6</del> 9 69	104,173 (501,976)					
TOTAL		4	\$ (803,798)	·	(397,803)					

CHALLANCOGA GAS COMPANY
IMCR - OFF SYSTEM SALES
CALCULATION OF INTEREST
FY 2001

	BALANCE	Off-System 50% of Profit	Off-System Refunded	E B BEFORE INTEREST	AVERAGE BALANCE	INTEREST RATE	CURRENT MO INT TO RECORD	AMOUNT RECORDED	ADJUSTMENT TO RECORD IN NEXT MONTH	Correct Ending GL Balance
October 00	(896,968)	c	c	200			***************************************		**************************************	
Vovember	(974 623)	> 0	<b>&gt;</b> (	(896,998)	(896,968)	0 7917%	(7,655)			(974,623)
	(070 + 10)	5	0	(974,623)	(974,623)	0 7917%	(7.716)			(000 000)
Jecember	(982,339)	0	156,429	(825.910)	(904 124)	0 7917%	0 1 6			(962,339)
iary 01	(833,068)	0	228 441	(504 627)	(740 047)	20.00	(oc. ' /)			(833,068)
uary	(610.318)		100 400	(100,000)	(10,017)	%/\B/O	(169'c)			(610,318)
٠,	(2) (2)	> 1	704'00	(429,836)	(520,077)	0 7917%	(4,117)			(433 953)
=	(508,504)	0	124,644	(309,309)	(371,631)	0 7917%	(0.942)			(100,000)
HD4	(312,251)	0	110,138	(202, 113)	(257 182)	0.7517%	(1.0.1)			(107.716)
	(204,046)	0	52 229	(151 817)	(477 024)	27.75	(556,T)			(204,046)
	(153,154)	· c	C64 86	(101,017)	(106,777)	8/10/0	(7,55,1)			(153, 154)
	(445 500)	<b>)</b>	70'00	(776'411)	(133,838)	0 /517%	(1,006)			(115 528)
	(070'011)	0	36,865	(78,663)	(97,095)	0 6492%	(630)			(0000)
St.	(79,293)	0	34.160	(45 133)	(62.213)	0 6402%	(90)			(78,283)
mber	(45,537)	C	34 778	(40.750)	(25,413)	0, 101,0	(404)			(45,537)
October 01	(10 042)	• 6		(66,101)	(20,140)	0 5482%	(38)			(10,942)
	(246,01)	>	43,781	32,839	10,949	0 5667%	83			32 001
vovembe/	32 901	0	70,885	103.786	68 344	0.5667%	785			105,20
December	104 173	c		707			Š			104,1/3
	•	•	•	5/1,40	104 1/3	0 5667%	290			104,763
OTAL	ì		4 444 404			ł				
,		•	404,				(39,733)	0	(39,733)	

C \My Documents\PGA Filings\IMCR\[offsys\_imcr FY2000 through june 2000 xis]IMCR Filing

104,763

Ending balance less revenue

Chattanooga Gas Company Off-System Sales

	Volume	Revenue	Cost	Profit	Customer Share	Cumulative	Int Rate	Int Costs		Cumulative Total
Adj 09/00	(1,000)	(4,797 50)	(4,757 06)	(40 44)	(20 22)					
ber	8,215	44,934 41	44,512 53	421 88	210.94	190 72	0.7917%	4 7	_	100 03
mper	301,969	1,441,601 42	1,400,442,57	41.158.85	20.579.42	20 771 65	7,010		٠ 	20.036.40
December	86,632	578,000 24	509,981 66	68,018,58	34 009 29	54 945 39	70100	40.44	9 13 1 0	20,830 10
12/00			2.183 00	(2,183.00)	(1.091.50)	54 288 87	0.7017%	404 90	96	53,300.37
January	37,635	416,996 27	380,411 35	36,584 92	18,292 46	73,011 12	0.7917%	428 CC 878 CC	9 <del>6</del>	73 580 12
uary	204,425	1,361,490 71	1,173,541 28	187,949 43	93,974,72	167 563 84	0.7917%	4 226 45 4 226 45	<b>→</b> 6	168 800 30
Ę.	229,321	1,242,677 78	1,031,720 37	210,957 41	105.478 71	274,369,09	0.7517%	5 250 33	) <del>(</del>	276 431 43
Aprıl	75,000	421,672 50	414,258 30	7,414 20	3,707 10	280,138 53	0.7517%	2,105	÷ +-	282 244 24
					25,000 00	307,244 24	0 7517%	2,309	- 10	309.553 69
					25,000 00	334,553 69	0 6492%	\$ 2,17181	· 49	336,725 50
					25,000 00	361,725 50	0 6492%	\$ 2,348 20	. <del>⇔</del>	364,073 70
્ર					25,000 00	389,073 70	0 6492%	5 2,525 74	ω.	391,599 44
ember					25,000 00	416,599 44	0 5667%	\$ 2,36073	<del>دی</del>	418,960 17
October					25,000 00	443,960 17	0 5667%	5 2,51577	69	446,475 95
November				-	25,000 00	471,475 95	0 5667%	\$ 2,67170	<del>(</del>	474,147,64
Jecember					25,000 00	499,147 64	0 5667%	\$ 2,828 50	₩	501,976 15
		5,502,575 83	4.952.294 00	550,281,83	475,140,92		J	\$ 26 835 23	6	504 076 45

#### Attachment C



#### Chattanooga Gas Company / 2207 Olan Mills Drive/ Chattanooga TN 37421 Telephone 1-800-427-5463

May 27, 2003

Ms Pat Murphy Tennessee Regulatory Authority Energy & Water Division 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243-0505

Dear Ms Murphy,

)

Pursuant to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority's Rules and Regulations, Chattanooga Gas Company (CGC) hereby files two (2) copies of the following revisions to Chattanooga Gas Tariff No 1

Seventy Second Revised Sheet No 55

We propose that this filing become effective July 1, 2003

This filing terminates the Actual Cost Adjustment (ACA) factors effective October 1, 2002, terminates the Interruptible Margin Credit Rider (IMCR) Refund Credit that became effective April 1, 2002, and implements a new IMCR Refund Credit to refund 100% of the asset management fees received by CGC for the calendar year ended December 31, 2002 and the resulting interest computed in accordance with the tariff as provided on CGC's Tariff, Second Revised Sheet 50E. The total being refunded through the IMCR Refund Credit has been adjusted to reflect an over-refund from the prior IMCR Refund Credit that became effective April 1, 2002.

The computation of the total amount to be refunded, including interest, is provided on Attachment A. The computation of the total refunds credited to customers from April 1, 2002-March 31, 2003 are provided on Attachment B and C. The computation of the IMCR Refund Credit to be effective July 1, 2003 is provided on Attachment D.

The net impact of this filing on the Residential and Commercial Customer classes is a \$ 1101 per Ccf rate reduction

Should there be any questions, I will be pleased to discuss this filing in further detail with you

Sincerely.

Archie R Hickerson

Manager-Rates

C Mr Dan McCormacMs Amanda Hwang

#### CURRENT LEVEL OF SURCHARGES AND REFUND CREDITS

## AMOUNTS INDICATED BELOW APPLY TO THE BILLING DETERMINANTS OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TARIFF

RATES Billing Unit	I-1 Demand MCF	I-1 Commodity MCF	L-1 Commodity MCF	T-1 Commodity MCF	T-2 Demand MCF	T-2 Commodity MCF	All Other CCF	A/C CCF	V-1 CCF
IMCR Refund 7-2003*	(0 1808)	0 0000	0 0000	0 0000	(0 1808)	0 0000	(0 0037)	(0 0037)	0 0000
TOTAL	(0 1808)	0 0000	0 0000	0 0000	(0 1808)	0 0000	(0 0037)	(0 0037)	0 0000

<sup>\*</sup>IMCR refund made effective July 1 2003 for a penod of 12 months or longer as may be required to refund IMCR balance

**EFFECTIVE** 

July 1 2003

<sup>\*</sup>IMCR refund made effective April 1 2002 terminated as of July 1 2003 Any over refund from April 1 2003-June 30 2003 will be included in the Off-System filling for Calendar Year 2003

<sup>\*\*</sup>ACA 01-02 surcharge made effective October 1 2002 for a period of 12 months terminated July 1 2003

Effective 1-July-2003	OMPANY GAS TARIFF TRA NO			REFUNDS &	BILLING	DOM: STREET
		BASE RATE	PGA	SURCHARGES	RATE	
R 1	WINTER (NOV APR)			-		
Residential	Base Use Charge/Bill	\$7 5000			\$7 5000	
General Service	First 25 CCF	\$0.2900	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$1 0160	
	Next 25 CCF	\$0 2000	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 9260	
	Over 50 CCF	\$0 1750	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 9010	
	SUMMER (MAY OCT)			•		
	Base Use Charge/Bill	\$7 5000			\$7 5000	
	First 25 CCF	\$0 2100	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 9360	
	Next 25 CCF	\$0 1500	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 8760	
	Over 50 CCF	\$0 0450	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 7710	
Air Conditioning	SUMMER (MAY OCT)					
- a conducting	Over 50 CCF	*0.0450	*****			
Standby Service	Over 50 CCF	\$0 0450	\$0 5717	(0 0037)	\$0 6130	
Demand Charge	Rate Per CCF of Input per Mont	\$0 3000	£0.7400	(0.0101)		
		30 3000	\$0 7198	(0 0181)	\$1 0017	
R-4	WINTER (NOV APR)					
Multi-Family	Base Use Charge/Unit	\$6 0000			\$6 0000	
Housing Service	Commodity Charge/CCF	\$0 1800	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 9060	
		***		(0 0001)	40 5000	
	SUMMER (MAY OCT)					
	Base Use Charge/Bill	\$6 0000			\$6 0000	
	Commodity Charge/CCF	\$0 1600	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 8860	
	·			(0 0001)	<b>40 0000</b>	
Air Conditioning	SUMMER (MAY OCT)					
	Flat Rate / CCF	\$0 0450	\$0 5717	(0 0037)	\$0 6130	
				,000.)	40.0100	
C 1	WINTER (NOV APR)					
Commercial & Industrial	Base Use Charge/Bill	\$20 0000			\$20 0000	
General Service	First 3 000 CCF	\$0.2750	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$1 0010	
	Next 2 000 CCF	0 2510	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 9770	
	Next 10 000 CCF	0 2445	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 9705	
	Over 15 000 CCF	0 1265	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 8525	
	SUMMER (MAY OCT)					
	Base Use Charge/Bill	\$15 0000			\$15 0000	
	First 3 000 CCF	<b>\$0</b> 2159	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 9419	
	Next 2 000 CCF	0 1714	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 8974	
	Next 10 000 CCF	0 1598	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 8858	
	Over 15 000 CCF	0 1265	\$0 7297	(0 0037)	\$0 8525	
Air Conditioning	SUBSIED MANY COT					
in conditioning	SUMMER (MAY OCT) Flat Rate / CCF	******	** ***			
Standby Service	rial Nate / CCF	\$0 0450	\$0 5717	(0 0037)	\$0 6130	
Demand Charge	Rate Per CCF of Input per Mont	\$0 3000	0.7400	(0.040.1)		
	The second of the per work	\$0.3000	0 7198	(0 0181)	\$1 0017	
<b>⊦1</b>	Base Use Charge	\$300 0000			£200 0000	
Large Volume	Demand Charge / Demand Unit	\$3 0000	\$7 1981	(0.1909)	\$300 0000	
Firm Service	Commodity Charge / MCF	*******	<b>9.</b> 1301	(0 1808)	\$10 0173	
	First 1 500 MCF	\$0 8888	\$5 7171	0 0000	\$6 6059	
	Next 2 500 MCF	\$0 7598	\$57171	0 0000	\$6 4769	
	Next 11 000 MCF	\$0 4312	\$5 7171	0 0000	\$6 1483	
	Over 15 000 MCF	\$0 2650	\$5 717t	0 0000	\$5 9821	
·					43 302 1	
L 1	Base Use Charge	\$300 0000			\$300 0000	
nterruptible Service	Commodity Charge/MCF				***********	
	First 1 500 MCF	\$0 8888	\$6 3369	0 0000	\$7.2257	
	Next 2 500 MCF	\$0 7598	\$6 3369	0 0000	\$7 0967	
	Next 11 000 MCF	\$0 4312	\$6 3369	0 0000	\$6 7681	
	Over 15 000 MCF	\$0 2650	\$6 3369	0 0000	\$6 6019	
r 4						
Γ1	Customer Charge	\$300 0000			\$300 0000	
nterruptible Transportatio	Transportation Charge/MCF				******	
Service	First 1 500 MCF	\$0 8888		0 0000	\$0 8888	
	Next 2,500 MCF	\$0 7598		0 0000	\$0 7598	
	Next 11 000 MCF	\$0 4312		0 0000	\$0 4312	
	Over 15 000 MCF	\$0.2650		0 0000	\$0.2650	
7 2	Customer Characteristics		_			
	Customer Charge	\$300 0000			\$300 0000	
Rencounte Transportatio	Demand Charge/Demand Unit	\$3 0000	\$7 1981	(0 1808)	\$10 0173	
A VICE WILLI FIRM Backup	Transportation Charge/MCF					
	First 1 500 MCF	\$0 8888		0 0000	\$0 8888	
	Next 2 500 MCF	\$0 7598		0 0000	\$0 7598	
		\$0 4312		0 0000	\$0 4312	
	Next 11 000 MCF					
	Over 15 000 MCF	\$0.2650		0 0000	\$0 2650	
/1						
	Over 15 000 MCF	\$0.2650	-			
/ 1 latural Gas Vehicle lervice			 0 59537			

Attachment A

Chattanooga Gas Company
Off-System Sales Sharing
Calendar Year 2002
Computation of Interest and Total to be Refunded June 1, 2003-June30, 2003

}

			25,117 50	50,353 05	75,707 21	101,108 36	126,610 69	152,214 61	177,916 08	203,719 29	229,624 64	255,632 53	281,743 37	307,957 56	309,143 20	310,333 40	311,528 18	312,631 51	313,738 75	314,849 90	(6,691 47)
			ઝ																		↔
		Interest	117 50	235 55	354 16	401 15	502 33	603 92	701 47	803 21	905 35	1,007 89	1,11084	1,214 19	1,18564	1,190 20	1,194 78	1,103 33	1,107 24	1,111 16	<u> </u>
			₩	. 0	. 0	. 0	. 0				_	_	_	_	_	_	_				fund
Monthly	Interest	Rate	0 4700%	0 4700%	0 4700%	0 3983%	0 3983%	0 3983%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3850%	0 3850%	0 3850%	0 3542%	0 3542%	0 3542%	1 (Over-Re
Annual	Interest	Rate	5 64%	5 64%	5 64%	4 78%	4 78%	4 78%	4 75%	4 75%	4 75%	4 75%	4 75%	4 75%	4 62%	4 62%	4 62%	4 25%	4 25%	4 25%	ward from 200
		Cumulative	\$ 25,000 00	50,117 50	75,353 05	100,707 21	126,108 36	151,610 69	177,214 61	202,916 08	228,719 29	254,624 64	280,632 53	306,743 37	307,957 56	309,143 20	310,333 40	311,528 18	312,631 51	313,738 75	Balance carry forward from 2001 (Over-Refund)
	Ratepayer	Share	\$ 25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00							
Asset	Management	Fee	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00							
	_		Jan-02 \$	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02	Jul-02	Aug-02	Sep-02	Oct-02	Nov-02	Dec-02	<b>Jan-</b> 03	Feb-03	Mar-03	Apr-03	May-03	Jun-03	

308,158 43

€\$

Total to be refunded

Chattanooga Gas Company Off-System Sales Reconciliation of Refund for Calendar Year 2001 (April 2002-March 2003)

Unfrunded Balance	Inciulding	399,080 05	400,955 73	402,840 22	367,783 44	349,395 48	334,991 72	323,822 97	313,546 03	302,257 24	289,138 89	266,029 52	208,512 72	139,728 12	53,054 69	(6,691 47)
Current Month	Interest	1,866 90	1,875 68	1 884 49	1,531 77	1,425 54	1 360 36	1,301 33	1 258 97	1,216 37	1,168 16	1,096 60	937 34	80 699	370 39	80 68
	Interest Rate	0 4700%	0 4700%	0 4700%	0 3983%	0 3983%	0 3983%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3958%	0 3850%	0 3850%	0 3850%
Annual	Interest Kate	5 64%	5 64%	5 64%	4 78%	4 78%	4 78%	4 75%	4 75%	4 75%	4 75%	4 75%	4 75%	4 62%	4 62%	4 62%
Average	Balance	\$ 397 213 15	399 080 05	400,955 73	384 545 94	357,876 69	341 513 42	328,756 68	318 055 02	307,293 45	295,113 98	277,035 90	236,802 45	173,785 88	96,206 21	23,137 07
End Balance	berore interest	\$ 397,213 15	399,080 05	400,955 73	366,251 67	347 969 94	333,631 35	322 521 65	312,287 06	301,040 87	287,970 73	264,932 92	207,575 37	139,059 04	52,684 29	(6 780 55)
Off-System	Kelunds				(36 588 55)	(19,813 50)	(15 764 13)	(12,470 07)	(11,535 91)	(12,505 16)	(14,286 51)	(24,205 97)	(58,454 15)	(69,453 67)	(87,043 83)	(59,835 24)
Beginning	Dalalice	397,213 15	399,080 05	400,955 73	402,840 22	367,783 44	349,395 48	334,991 72	323,822 97	313 546 03	302,257 24	289,138 89	266,029 52	208,512 72	139,728 12	53 054 69
		↔								L						
4400	5	2002 January	February	March	April	Мау	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	2003 January	February	March
>	<u>a</u>	200												2000		

Chattanooga Gas Company
Off-System Sales Sharing
Calendar Year 2002
Summary of Refunds April 1, 2002-March 31, 2003

Total Refund		(36,588 55)	(19,813 50)	(15,764 13)	(12,470 07)	(11,53591)	(12,505 16)	(14,286 51)	(24,20597)	(58,45415)	(69,453 67)	(87,043 83)	(59,835 24)
Refund to		(2,052 11) \$	(2,052 11)	(2,052 11)	(2,052 11)	(2,05211)	(2,170 04)	(2,170 04)	(2,049 98)	(2,11415)	(2,136 88)	(2,13688)	(2,144 46)
Refund Factor		\$ (0 2368) \$	(0 2368)	(0.2368)	(0 2368)	(0 2368)	(0 2368)	(0 2368)	(0 2368)	(0 2368)	(0 2368)	(0 2368)	(0 2368)
Demand Units	-	8,666	8,666	8,666	8,666	8,666	9,164	9,164	8,657	8,928	9,024	9,024	9,056
Refund to	All Other	(34,53645)	(17,761 39)	(13,71202)	(10,417 96)	(9,483 80)	(10,335 13)	(12,116 47)	(22,15599)	(56,34000)	(67,316 79)	(84,906 94)	(57,690 78)
Refund Factor	Per MCF	\$ (0 0511) \$	(0 0511)	(0 0511)	(0.0511)	(0 0511)	(0 0511)	(0.0511)	(0 0511)	(0 0511)	(0 0511)	(0 0511)	(0 0511)
All Other	MOM	675,860	347,581	268,337	203,874	185,593	202,253	237,113	433,581	1,102,544	1,317,354	1,661,584	1,128,978
		Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02	Jul-02	Aug-02	Sep-02	Oct-02	Nov-02	Dec-02	Jan-03	Feb-03	Mar-03

(421,956 69)

(25,182 97) \$

↔

(396,773 72)

↔

#### Attachment D

#### CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY

Refund of Off-System Sales Shanng for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2002

Rate Schedule	Monthly Contract Demand	Annual Commodity MCF Sales	Demand	Commodity	Total	Demand Per Unit	<u>De</u> mand	Commodity	Total
I-1 L-1	9,056	\$	(19 648 13)		\$ (19 648 13)	\$ (0 18080)	Demand	Commodity	<u>Total</u> \$ (0 18080)
T-2 ALL OTHER V-1	132 977	7 764 652 \$	(288 510 30)		\$ (288 510 30)	\$ (0 18080)	\$ (0 03716)	\$ -	\$ (0 18080) \$ (0 03720)
Total Cost Adjustment	142 033	7 764 652 \$	(308 158 43)		\$ (308 158 43)				

BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDED RATES TO BE EFFECTIVE

March 31 2002

July 1 2003

## Attachment D

#### INTERRUPTIBLE MARGIN CREDIT RIDER

#### **APPLICABILITY**

This Rider shall apply to and become part of each of the Company's Rate Schedules under which gas is sold on a firm basis (hereinafter referred to as "Firm Schedule")

#### **INTENT AND APPLICATION**

This Interruptible Margin Credit Rider is intended to authorize the Company to recover ninety percent (90%) of the gross profit margin losses that result from rates negotiated under the provisions of Special Service Rate Schedule SS-1 or from customers who switch to dternate fuels where the Company is unable to meet alternate fuel competition

This Interruptible Margin Credit Rider is also intended to authorize the Company to recover not more than fifty percent (50%) of the gross profit margin that results from transactions with non-jurisdictional customers that rely on the Company's gas supply assets (all such transactions including off-system sales) should such transactions be made by the Company

#### **DETERMINATION OF GROSS PROFIT MARGIN LOSSES**

The gross profit margin loss shall be calculated as ninety percent (90%) of the difference between the Test-Year Targeted Rate Margin as determined in the Company's most recent rate case order of the Authority and the Actual Negotiated Rate Margin

Any amount of gross profit margin losses shall be recovered from the firm commodity component of gas costs as determined under the presently effective Purchased Gas Adjustment Provision

#### FILING WITH THE AUTHORITY

Each negotiated rate gross profit margin loss accounting/recovery period shall correspond with the Company's Fiscal Year, which ends December 31, each year

The Company shall charge all authorized negotiated rate gross profit margin losses to the "Deferred Gas Cost" account in accordance with Section III C of the Authority's PGA Docket No G86-1 and shall file the supplemental sheets required by this Rule showing the calculation of the margin losses

#### Attachment E

## TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman Pat Miller, Director Sara Kyle, Director Ron Jones, Director



460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505

July 15, 2003

Mr Archie R Hickerson Manager - Rates Atlanta Gas Light Company Location 1686 P O Box 4569 Atlanta, GA 30302-4569

Dear Mr Hickerson

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated June 16, 2003, enclosing a Tariff revision to Chattanooga Gas Company (CGC) Tariff No 1

Sixth Revised Sheet No 48, Interruptible Margin Credit Rider (IMCR)

The tariff revision was proposed to modify the language of the current tariff to include all non-sales transactions between CGC and non-jurisdictional customers. The current tariff addresses only off-systems sales. Market conditions have since changed to enable the Company to enter into other transactions that utilize CGC's gas supply assets. I have reviewed the proposed changes and the Company's responses to the Staff's data request and the requested revision appears to be appropriate. The proposed effective date also appears to be appropriate. Chattanooga filed a PGA on May 27, 2002 to implement IMCR refund credits for the reporting period ending December 31, 2002. Therefore, Sixth Revised Sheet No. 48 is approved to be effective January 1, 2003, the beginning of the Company's next reporting period for these non-sales transactions.

For future reference, this Tariff filing is logged as number 03-00408 Please refer to this number in any correspondence regarding this particular filing

Sincerely,

Pat Murphy Interim Chief

Energy and Water Division

PM03-40 cgctariff

### Attachment F

1

.

RECEIVED
2004 KAR 29 PK 3 06

# BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

#### March 29, 2004

IN RE:	)	
NASHVILLE GAS COMPANY, a Division of	)	Docket No. 03-00489
PIEDMONT NATURAL GAS COMPANY	)	Docker 110. 03-00407
INCENTIVE PLAN ACCOUNT (IPA) AUDIT	)	

## NOTICE OF FILING BY ENERGY AND WATER DIVISION OF THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Pursuant to Tenn Code Ann §§ 65-4-104, 65-4-111 and 65-3-108, the Energy and Water Division of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (hereafter "Energy and Water") hereby gives notice of its filing of the Nashville Gas Company Incentive Plan Account (hereafter "IPA") Audit Report in this docket and would respectfully state as follows

- 1. The present docket was opened by the Authority to hear matters arising out of the audit of Nashville Gas Company's (hereafter the "Company") IPA for the year ended June 30, 2003
- The Company's IPA filing was received on August 22, 2003, and the Staff completed its audit of same on March 5, 2004
- On March 11, 2004, the Energy and Water Division issued its preliminary IPA audit findings to the Company, and on March 18, 2004, the Company responded

thereto Further communications ensued regarding the preliminary findings and the Company's final response was received on March 22, 2004

- The preliminary IPA audit report was modified to reflect the Company's responses and a final IPA audit report (the "Report") resulted therefrom. The Report is attached hereto as <a href="Exhibit A">Exhibit A</a> and is fully incorporated herein by this reference. The Report contains the audit findings of the Energy and Water Division, the Company's responses thereto and the recommendations of the Energy and Water Division in connection therewith
- The Energy and Water Division hereby files its Report with the Tennessee Regulatory Authority for deposit as a public record and approval of the findings and recommendations contained therein

Respectfully Submitted

Pat Murphy
Energy and Water Division of the
Tennessee Regulatory Authority

Toughy

2

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 29th day of March 2004, a true and exact copy of the foregoing has been either hand-delivered or delivered via U.S. Mail, postage pre-paid, to the following persons

Deborah Taylor Tate Chairman Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243

Mr Bill R Morris Director of Corporate Planning and Development Services Piedmont Natural Gas Company P O Box 33068 Charlotte, NC 28233

Mr David Carpenter Director-Rates Piedmont Natural Gas Company P O Box 33068

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 29th day of March 2004, a true and exact copy of the foregoing has been either hand-delivered or delivered via U S Mail, postage pre-paid, to the following persons

Deborah Taylor Tate Chairman Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243

Mr Bill R Morris
Director of Corporate Planning and Development Services
Piedmont Natural Gas Company
P O Box 33068
Charlotte, NC 28233

Mr David Carpenter
Director-Rates
Piedmont Natural Gas Company
P O Box 33068
Charlotte, NC 28233

## COMPLIANCE AUDIT REPORT OF

## NASHVILLE GAS COMPANY'S INCENTIVE PLAN ACCOUNT

Docket No 03-00489

#### PREPARED BY

## TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

ENERGY AND WATER DIVISION

MARCH 2004

## TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY'S COMPLIANCE AUDIT

οf

# NASHVILLE GAS COMPANY'S INCENTIVE PLAN ACCOUNT

## Docket No. 03-00489

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE PLAN	2
III.	ACTUAL PLAN YEAR RESULTS	3
IV.	AUDIT SCOPE	4
V.	INCENTIVE PLAN (IPA) FINDINGS	5
VI.	AUDIT CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12
VII.	JURISDICTION OF TENNESSEE RECULATORY AUTHORITY	1.4

#### I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The subject of this compliance audit is the Performance Incentive Plan (hereafter "Incentive Plan" or "IPA") of Nashville Gas Company (hereafter "Nashville Gas," "Nashville" or the "Company"), a division of Piedmont Natural Gas Company. The objective of the audit was to determine whether the balance in the Incentive Plan Account as of June 30, 2003 was calculated in conformance with the terms of the Incentive Plan and to verify that the factors utilized in the calculations were supported by appropriate source documentation. The IPA consists of two mechanisms, which are more fully described in Section II

The following chart summarizes the results of the current period of the Incentive Plan,  $\underline{as}$  presented in the Company's filing

		Plan Year Ended 6/30/03
Total Actual City Gate Purchases	\$	<u>107,496,621</u>
Total Annual Benchmark	\$	108,374,618
Percentage Actual Purchases to Benchmark	\$	99 19%
Total Incentive Savings (Losses) from: Gas Procurement Capacity Management Total Incentive Savings	\$ \$	1,288,018 2,201,654 3,489,672
Incentive Savings (Losses) Retained by Ratepayers: Gas Procurement Capacity Management Total Incentive Savings to Ratepayers	<b>\$</b>	654,443 1,235,229 1,889,672
Incentive Savings (Losses) Retained by Company: Gas Procurement Capacity Management Total Incentive Savings to Company	\$ \$	633,575 966,425 1,600,000

Section III of this report further describes the actual results of the plan year and Section V details the Staff's findings

#### II. BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE PLAN

On May 31, 1996, the Tennessee Public Service Commission (hereafter the "TPSC"), the predecessor to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (hereafter the "Authority" or "TRA"), issued an Order in Docket 96-00805 approving the Incentive Plan on an experimental basis for Nashville Gas The specific details of the Incentive Plan were included in Nashville Gas' Service Schedule No 14 tariff entitled <u>Performance Incentive Plan</u>, which was issued on April 22, 1996, and was effective July 1, 1996 A copy of this tariff is attached to the report as <u>Attachment 1</u>

The experimental period began July 1, 1996, and ended June 30, 1998. On March 31, 1998, the Company filed an Application for Extension of the Performance Incentive Plan, which would allow the plan to continue on an annual basis. The Authority issued an Order on March 11, 1999, authorizing the Company to continue under a modified Incentive Plan. The Incentive Plan automatically rolls over for an additional plan year on each July 1<sup>st</sup>, beginning July 1, 1998, and continues until the Incentive Plan is either (a) terminated at the end of a plan year by not less than 90 days notice by Nashville Gas to the Authority or (b) modified, amended or terminated by the Authority

The Incentive Plan consists of two mechanisms (1) the Gas Procurement Mechanism, and (2) the Capacity Management Mechanism. Under the Gas Procurement Mechanism, Nashville Gas retains 50% of the savings on gas purchased below 99% of a pre-determined benchmark. Should the Company purchase gas above 101% of the same pre-determined benchmark, the Company is penalized for 50% of the excess. The Capacity Management Mechanism is tied to the Company's total annual demand cost and the sharing ratio is a sliding scale, with Nashville Gas earning a larger percentage with a higher level of cost savings. Interest is accrued on the outstanding monthly balance in the IPA account using the same computation as is provided for in the Authority's Purchased Gas Adjustment Rule 1220-4-7-03(vii). A more detailed explanation of each mechanism can be found in Attachment 1.

#### III. ACTUAL PLAN YEAR RESULTS

On August 22, 2003, Nashville Gas submitted its annual report to the TRA Staff, showing its calculation of the balance in the Incentive Plan Account as of June 30, 2003 According to the Company filing, the Incentive Plan generated \$3,489,672 in total incentive savings. Of this amount, \$1,889,672 benefited the ratepayer and \$1,600,000 was retained by Nashville Gas. Adding the under-recovered balance from the previous period and accrued interest on the monthly balances, and subtracting the surcharges recovered from customers, resulted in an **under-recovered balance** in the account at June 30, 2003 of \$1,438,294. To recover this balance, the Company filed a PGA (tariff filing 03-00563) with the TRA Staff seeking approval to discontinue the previous year's surcharge and to implement a \$0 00718 per therm surcharge, effective November 1, 2003.

The Company was able to purchase gas at less than the benchmark in only six (6) months of the twelve (12) months in the audit period. In three (3) of these months, purchases fell within the 1% deadband, and the Company could not share in the savings. In three (3) months, the Company shared in that portion of the savings that fell below the 1% lower limit of the deadband. Purchases for the remaining six (6) months of the plan year were higher than the calculated benchmark. In two (2) of those months, the purchases also exceeded the 1% upper limit of the deadband. Therefore, the Company should have shared 50/50 with the ratepayers the portion of losses exceeding the 1%. Nashville Gas reflected its share of losses for one of those months. In the other month Nashville allocated the total loss to the ratepayers. Total actual city gate purchases for the year averaged 99 19% of the total annual benchmark. Of the \$1,288,018 total net gain reported under the Gas Procurement Mechanism, the Company retained \$633,575 and \$654,443 benefited the ratepayers.

Nashville reported savings under the Capacity Management Mechanism of \$2,201,654, of which \$607,767 was the result of off system sales and capacity release and \$1,593,887 was the payment received from its Asset Manager <sup>4</sup> The Company's total actual demand costs for the year were \$9,391,980 Therefore, the Company did not participate in any savings until the savings reach \$93,920 (1% of the total demand costs), as provided for in the Incentive Plan Of the total savings achieved, the Company retained \$966,425 and \$1,235,229 benefited the ratepayers <sup>5</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Nashville has a cap on overall incentive gains and losses of \$1 6 million (Service Schedule No 14, Performance Incentive Plan, page 1)

The deadband is the 1 % range on either side of the benchmark, in which there is no sharing of incentive gains or losses

<sup>3</sup> See Staff Finding #1, in Section V of this report

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Under the Gas Asset Management agreement, Nashville Gas assigns its firm pipeline transportation (capacity), storage (excluding local LNG) and supply rights to the "Asset Manager" In return for this assignment, Nashville Gas receives a lump-sum payment from the asset manager for the assignment of these rights (Taken from the Company's description of its agreement)

The Company's share was reduced by \$26,396 because of the \$1 6 million cap

#### IV. AUDIT SCOPE

The IPA audit is a limited compliance audit of the Company's Incentive Plan account The audit goal was to verify that the Company's calculations of incentive gains and losses were materially correct, and that the Company is following all Authority orders and directives with respect to its calculation of the IPA account balance. Also included in this audit is the Company's PGA filing implementing a customer surcharge of the IPA account balance, effective November 1, 2003.

To accomplish the audit goal, Staff reviewed gas supply invoices, as well as supplemental schedules and other source documentation provided by Nashville Where needed, Staff issued data requests to the Company to obtain additional information to clarify the filing

The Authority's Energy and Water Division is responsible for auditing those companies under the Division's jurisdiction to insure that each company is abiding by the rules and regulations of the TRA. This audit was performed by Pat Murphy of the Energy and Water Division

The audit goal is not to guarantee that the Company's results are 100% correct. Where it is appropriate, Staff utilizes sampling techniques to determine whether the Company's calculations are materially correct. Material discrepancies would dictate a broadening of the scope of Staff's review.

7 PGA/Tariff filing 03-00563

### V. <u>INCENTIVE PLAN (IPA) FINDINGS</u>

Staff reviewed the purchasing activities of Nashville Gas to determine whether the Company correctly calculated the amount of gains and losses under its Incentive Plan Below is a summary of the IPA account as filed by Nashville and as adjusted by Staff A description of findings follows

#### SUMMARY OF THE IPA ACCOUNT:

-	Company Filing	Staff Audit Results	Difference (Findings)		
IPA Account Balance at 6/30/02	\$ 1,741,051	\$ 1,741,051	\$ 0		
Plus Gas Procurement Savings	633,575	616,529	-17,046		
Plus Off-System Sales Margin	195,877	195,877	0		
Plus Capacity Release Savings	770,548	787,594	17,046		
Subtract Customer Surcharges	1,973,027	1,973,027	0		
Plus Interest on Account Balance	70,270	70,209	<u>-61</u>		
Equals IPA Account Balance at 6/30/03	<u>\$ 1,438,294</u>	<u>\$ 1,438,233</u>	<u>\$ -61</u>		

#### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

		<u> </u>	Page No
FINDING #1 Retention of Records FINDING #2 Request for Proposal (RFP) Process FINDING #3 Gas Procurement Savings Overstated FINDING #4 Capacity Release Savings Understated FINDING #5 Interest on Account Balance Overstated	\$ 0 0 -17,046 17,046 <u>-61</u>	No effect No effect Over-recovery Under-recovery Over-recovery	6 7 9 10
Net Result	\$ <u>61</u>	Over-recovery	

#### FINDING #1:

#### **Exception**

The Company failed to retain complete records (documentation) of its RFP process in the selection of an Asset Manager

#### Discussion

The asset management fee has been included in the Incentive Plan filing for sharing between Nashville and its ratepayers. Staff asked Nashville Gas (through data requests) to provide copies of the winning bids submitted by the two asset managers who ultimately were selected to manage Nashville's assets during the plan year under review. Staff also asked Nashville for a copy of the complete list of companies to which it emailed the RFP. The Company responded that the bids requested were provided verbally and that the list of RFP recipients is no longer available.

In order to audit Nashville's compliance with its Incentive Plan tariff, Staff must have access to all documentation needed to support savings claimed by the Company for sharing between the Company and its ratepayers. In the case of the Asset Management payment, the Company should be able to provide complete documentation of the RFP process.

#### Company Response

Nashville was unable to provide a copy of the winning bidder's response to the Company's RFP because the various bidders responses were provided to the Company verbally; however, Nashville did provide Staff copies of contracts that were executed by both asset managers that detail the terms under which they agreed to provide their asset management service and the compensation provided to Nashville for such service. In essence, the contracts are the written confirmation of the asset manager's response to the RFP

Staff did ask Nashville for a copy of the complete list of the companies to which it E-Mailed the RFP Nashville did provide a copy of the E-Mail sent out to potential asset managers. The E-mail references the RFP list kept by the Company. Nashville continuously updates its RFP list as new suppliers are used by the Company and the Company establishes a record of the potential asset manager's reliability, credit and trustworthiness. In the past, Nashville has not archived its RFP list as it is updated but will do so going forward. Nashville did send the RFP to all suppliers that were on the supplier list at the time the RFP was sent.

#### **Staff Response**

The Company states in its response, "In essence, the contracts are the written confirmation of the asset manager's response to the RFP" Staff agrees that the contract reflects

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> TRA Rule 1220-4-5- 05 <u>Retention of Records</u> The NARUC publication referenced states that the minimum retention period for contracts for services, including supporting documentation, is six (6) years (pages 38-39)

the final agreement between the parties However, without written documentation, Staff has no assurance that the winning bid was not manipulated by the parties

#### FINDING #2:

#### Exception

The Company cannot provide a clear audit trail for its RFP process used in the selection of an Asset Manager

#### **Discussion**

As stated in Finding #1, Staff attempted to review Nashville Gas's RFP process used in the selection of the asset managers during the audit period under review. Staff identified several issues that are cause for concern. One, the Company does not retain a copy of its email list of RFP recipients. Therefore, the Company could only report to Staff the companies that responded in some manner to the RFP. Two, the RFP was not publicly published. The Company determined which companies it wanted to consider and other potentially qualified companies were not given the opportunity to bid. Three, in the cases of Dynegy and Sempra, the winning bidders, Nashville could not produce a copy of their original bids. Nashville's response to Staff's inquiry was that these bids were provided "verbally". When asked for copies of the follow-up bids from the two highest bidders, again the Company said the bids (Sempra and Entergy Koch) were provided verbally.

It is obvious from the Company's responses that there is no clear audit trail for Staff to determine whether or not preference was given to any bidder in the RFP process. At the time Dynegy was selected as asset manager, Piedmont was involved in the SouthStar joint venture with Dynegy and a third party. Piedmont states, "In all of its dealings with Dynegy as a supplier or asset manager, Piedmont treated Dynegy the same as it did all other suppliers/asset managers with which it had similar experience." However, based on the information provided by Piedmont, Staff cannot provide assurance to the Authority that the selection process was transparent and unbiased.

#### **Company Response**

The Company responded to the first of Staff's issues in response to finding number one

In response to issue number two, the Company, by publicly publishing its RFP, would disclose information regarding its business, which Piedmont considers to be competitively sensitive. Secondly, Piedmont typically sends its RFP's to suppliers that have established a reliable relationship with Piedmont through previous supply and/or sales arrangements or an asset manager that has acquired the same reputation through dealings with others known to Piedmont. Piedmont would only engage in an asset management arrangement with an entity that has satisfactory credit sufficient to pay damages in the event of non-performance. For the period that Dynegy was selected as the asset manager, six companies responded to Nashville's RFP, with Dynegy out bidding the next highest bidder by \$1,399,000. Lastly, the Company also incurs no cost in E-mailing the RFP to suppliers that meet its reliability and credit requirements. Publicly publishing an RFP would result in considerable cost given the length

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Company's response to Staff's February 10, 2004 data request, question 4 (b)

and detail of an asset management RFP The Company is also not aware of any publication or company that publicly publishes RFP's for asset management
•

### FINDING #3:

### **Exception**

The Company understated its share of calculated losses under the Gas Procurement Mechanism for the month of May 2003 by \$17,046 This represents a \$17,046 over-recovery from customers

### Discussion

The Incentive Plan tariff under the Gas Procurement Mechanism provides for 50/50 sharing of any gains that occur below 99 per cent of the calculated benchmark and losses that occur above 101 percent of the same benchmark. In May 2003, the actual gas purchases were \$4,452,632. The calculated benchmark for that month was \$4,374,792. Since actual gas purchase costs were greater than the benchmark, a loss of \$77,840 occurred, of which \$34,092 was above the 101 percent ceiling. According to the terms of the tariff, Nashville should absorb \$17,046 of this loss.

### **Company Response**

Nashville agrees with the conclusions of Staff in Finding #3 The deadband was miscalculated by the Company by the amount stated by Staff

#### FINDING #4:

### Exception

The Company understated its share of savings under the Capacity Release Mechanism by \$17,046 This represents a \$17,046 under-recovery from customers

### **Discussion**

Nashville had two asset managers during the audit period. Dynegy managed Nashville's assets July through October 2002 and Sempra managed the assets April through June 2003. Sempra made a payment to Nashville in April 2003 for the use of these assets during periods of time when Nashville did not need them. The payment agreed upon in the contract dated January 28, 2003 was \$1.1 million plus an additional amount depending on the ending storage balances at March 31, 2003. The total amount Nashville received was \$1,593,887.

Based on the sliding scale outlined in the Capacity Management mechanism, the sharing percentage for this amount is 50/50. While the Company did calculate its share as \$796,944, it reduced its share by \$26,396, since its total calculated savings exceeded the \$1.6 million cap by this amount. Staff's total calculated savings exceeded the cap by \$9,350, due to the reduction in Gas Procurement savings as shown in Finding #4. Therefore, Staff increased the Capacity Release savings by the difference between the \$26,396 (Company) and \$9,350 (Staff) or \$17,046

### Company Response

Nashville agrees with the conclusions of Staff in Finding #4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Nashville Gas Service Schedule No 14 (Performance Incentive Plan), Overview of Structure, page 1

### FINDING #5:

## Exception

The Company overstated the amount of interest owed by ratepayers by \$61 This represents a **\$61 over-recovery** from customers

# Discussion

Staff recalculated the amount of interest on monthly account balance after making adjustments for Findings #3 and #4

# **Company Response**

Nashville agrees with the conclusions of Staff in Finding #5

# VI. <u>AUDIT CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

#### **Conclusions**

Nashville Gas, except for the findings noted, has correctly calculated its share of savings under its Service Schedule No 14, <u>Performance Incentive Plan</u>, for the plan year ended June 30, 2003 The net findings are immaterial to the Company's filing However, Staff has identified issues pertaining to the Incentive Plan tariff that need to be addressed going forward. The following concerns came to light during this audit

The <u>first concern</u> is the asset management payment. Staff now believes that it was in error in allowing the inclusion of this payment for sharing under the Incentive Plan. The Company acted in good faith by including this payment for the current year under audit, based on past decisions of this Authority. Going forward, however, Staff believes this payment should be excluded from the Incentive Plan. The tariff reads

"To the extent Nashville is able to release transportation or storage capacity, or generate transportation or storage margin associated with off-system or wholesale sales-for-resale, the associated cost savings shall be shared by Nashville and customers according to the following sharing formula" "11"

The tariff, as written, does not provide for an asset management fee. The only transactions included in the plan under the Capacity Management Incentive Mechanism are the Company's release of excess capacity and off-system sales. The engagement of an asset manager by Nashville to manage its assets is not a transaction covered by the tariff

Also, the goal of an incentive plan is to encourage or "incent" companies to actively engage in purchase activities that generate approved gas cost savings for consumers. These activities should go beyond the normal prudent gas purchasing that is expected of a regulated utility. Engaging an asset manager to perform the activities on behalf of the company, does not demonstrate additional effort on the part of the company. As described in Finding #2, Nashville's RFP process consists primarily of emails to prospective asset managers and email or verbal responses. This process takes place typically once a year.

Additionally, Nashville is not able to provide Staff with a basis for the amount of the fee paid by the asset manager. The assets committed to the asset manager have been paid for by the consumer and therefore the consumer is entitled to a fair return on those assets. Logic dictates that the asset manager is making profits well in excess of the payment made to Nashville. Due to the complexity of this issue, Staff does not have the ability to determine whether or not the payments are fair and reasonable.

The <u>second concern</u> is the RFP process. The selection process should be transparent and fair to all parties. Failure to retain documentation, restricting RFP recipients and verbal bids that are not documented are all red flags to auditors. In the current accounting environment,

<sup>11</sup> Service Schedule No 14, Performance Incentive Plan, page 4

following the collapse of such companies as Enron and WorldCom, financial transactions must be transparent and able to be audited. The federal government responded to these high-profile business failures with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. This legislation has significant impact on the standards to which the accounting profession is held.

The third concern is the use of nationally published indexes in the Incentive Plan There have been recent reports of flaws in the price indexes that are compiled by trade magazines. They include allegations of false reporting and manipulation of the indexes. The Commodity Future Trading Commission (CFTC) has imposed civil penalties against a number of energy companies. Reporting of prices is voluntary and the number of companies participating has declined. As an example, the following gas companies do not report their trades to a national index service. Nashville Gas, Piedmont Natural Gas, Atmos Energy and Woodward Marketing. With a smaller sample population, there is more likelihood that market prices could be manipulated.

The <u>final concern</u> is the level of excess capacity maintained by Nashville Gas. A certain amount of excess capacity on the pipeline is necessary to guarantee delivery of gas to the firm residential customers on the projected coldest day of the year. What this level reasonably needs to be has not been addressed in Nashville's Incentive Plan. During the remainder of the year, excess capacity can be released to third parties to generate additional savings under the Incentive Plan that will benefit the Company's shareholders. Staff needs assurance that the level of capacity is reasonable and that the customers are not paying for capacity they don't need.

# Recommendations

- The Authority should suspend the Incentive Plan<sup>13</sup> going forward and address the following issues
  - a Inclusion of the Asset Management Fee
  - b Validity of the indexes used
  - c Reasonable level of excess capacity
- 2 The Authority should instruct Staff to oversee the RFP process
- The Authority should engage a consultant (paid for by the Company) to assist Staff with the audit process going forward. The complexity of the issues identified in this audit requires expert knowledge of the industry.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Atmos response to Staff DR dated March 1, 2004, #7 (Docket 03-00515) and Piedmont response to Staff DR dated December 17, 2003, #4 (Docket 03-00489)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Service Schedule No 14, Performance Incentive Plan, page 1 states, "The Plan will continue until the Plan is either (a) terminated at the end of a plan year by not less than 90 days notice by Nashville to the Authority or (b) the Plan is modified, amended or terminated by the Authority"

# V. JURISDICTION OF THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Tennessee Code Annotated (hereafter "T C A") gave jurisdiction and control over public utilities to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority T C A § 65-4-104 states

The Authority has general supervisory and regulatory power, jurisdiction, and control over all public utilities, and also over their property, property rights, facilities, and franchises, so far as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter

Further, T C A § 65-4-105 grants the same power to the Authority with reference to all public utilities within its jurisdiction as chapters 3 and 5 of Title 65 of the T C A has conferred on the Department of Transportation's oversight of the railroads or the Department of Safety's oversight of transportation companies By virtue of T C A § 65-3-108, said power includes the right to audit

The department is given full power to examine the books and papers of the said companies, and to examine, under oath, the officers, agents, and employees of said companies to procure the necessary information to intelligently and justly discharge their duties and carry out the provisions of this chapter and chapter 5 of this title

NASHVILLE GAS COMPANY
665 Mainstream Drive
Nashville, Tennessee 37228
A Division of Piedmont Natural Gas Company
TRA Service Schedule No 14

ATTACHMENT 1

Original Sheet No 14 Page 1 of 6

# SERVICE SCHEDULE NO. 14 Performance Incentive Plan

# APPLICABILITY

The Performance Incentive Plan (the plan) replaces the reasonableness or prudence review of Nashville Gas Company's (Nashville or Company) gas purchasing activities overseen by the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (Authority) The plan is designed to provide incentives to Nashville in a manner that will produce rewards for its customers and its shareholders and improvements in Nashville's gas procurement activities. Each plan year will begin July 1. The annual provisions and filings herein would apply to this annual period. The Plan will continue until the Plan is either (a) terminated at the end of a plan year by not less than 90 days notice by Nashville to the Authority or (b) the Plan is modified, amended or terminated by the Authority

# **OVERVIEW OF STRUCTURE**

Nashville's Performance Incentive Plan is comprised of two interrelated components

- Gas Procurement Incentive Mechanism
- Capacity Management Incentive Mechanism

The Gas Procurement Incentive Mechanism establishes a predefined benchmark index to which Nashville's commodity cost of gas is compared. It also addresses the recovery of gas supply reservation fees, the treatment of off-system sales and wholesale interstate sale for resale transactions, and the use of financial or private contracts in managing gas costs. The net incentive benefits or costs will be shared between the Company's customers and the Company on a 50% / 50% basis

The Capacity Management Incentive Mechanism is designed to encourage Nashville to actively market off-peak unutilized transportation and storage capacity on upstream pipelines in the secondary market. The net incentive benefits or costs will be shared between the Company's customers and the Company utilizing a graduated sharing formula, with sharing percentages for Nashville ranging between zero and fifty percent.

The Company is subject to a cap on overall incentive gains or losses of \$1 6 million annually. In connection with the Performance Incentive Plan, Nashville shall file with the Authority Staff, and update each year a Three Year Supply Plan. Nashville will obtain additional firm capacity and/or gas supply pursuant to such plan.

# GAS PROCUREMENT INCENTIVE MECHANISM

The Gas Procurement Incentive Mechanism addresses the following areas

Issued By John H Maxheim Issued On October 20 1998

Effective July 1, 1998 Docket No 96-00805 NASHVILLE GAS COMPANY
665 Mainstream Drive
Nashville, Tennessee 37228
A Division of Piedmont Natural Gas Company
TRA Service Schedule No 14

Onginal Sheet No 14 Page 2 of 6

- Commodity Costs
- Gas Supply Reservation Fees
- Off-System Sales and Sale for Resale Transactions
- Use of Financial Instruments or Other Private Contracts

# **COMMODITY COSTS**

Each month Nashville will compare its total city gate commodity cost of gas<sup>1</sup> to a benchmark dollar amount. The benchmark gas cost will be computed by multiplying total actual purchase quantities for the month by a price index. The monthly price index is defined as

$$I = F_1(P_0K_0 + P_1K_1 + P_cK_c + ...P_cK_c) + F_0O + F_dD$$
, where

$$F_t + F_o + F_d = 1$$
, and

I = the monthly city gate commodity gas cost index

 $F_f$  = the fraction of gas supplies purchased in the first-of-the-month market which are transported to the city gate under Nashville's FT service agreements

P = the Inside FERC Gas Market Report price index for the first-of-the-month edition for a geographic pricing region, where subscript 0 denotes Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Rate Zone 0; subscript 1 denotes TGP Rate Zone 1, subscript C denotes Columbia Gas Transmission (CGT), Louisiana, plus applicable transportation and fuel charges in CGT's FT tariff to Rayne, and subscript \propto denotes new incremental firm services to which Nashville may

Gas purchases under Nashville's existing supply contract on the Tetco system are excluded from the incentive mechanism. Nashville will continue to recover 100 percent of these costs through its PGA with no profit or loss potential. Extension or replacement of such contract shall be subject to the same competitive bidding procedures that will apply to other firm gas supply agreements. In addition, Nashville's gas procurement incentive mechanism will measure storage gas supplies against the benchmark index during the months such quantities are purchased for injection. For purposes of comparing such gas purchase costs against the monthly city gate index price, Nashville will exclude any commodity costs incurred downstream of the city gate to storage so that Nashville's actual costs and the benchmark index are calculated on the same basis.

subscribe in the future <sup>2</sup> The commodity index prices will be adjusted to include the appropriate pipeline maximum firm transportation (FT) commodity transportation charges and fuel retention to the city gate under Nashville's FT service agreements

K = the fraction (relative to total maximum daily contract entitlement) of Nashville's total firm transportation capacity under contract in a geographic pricing region, where the subscripts are as above <sup>3</sup>

F<sub>o</sub> = the fraction of gas supplies purchased in the first-of-the-month spot market which are delivered to Nashville's system using transportation arrangements other than Nashville's FT contracts.

O = the weighted average of *Inside FERC Gas Market Report* first-of-themonth price indices, plus applicable maximum IT rates and fuel retention, from the source of the gas to the city gate, where the weights are computed based on actual purchases of gas supplies purchased by Nashville and delivered to Nashville's system using transportation arrangements other than Nashville's FT contracts

 $F_d$  = the fraction of gas supplies purchased in the daily spot market

D = the weighted average of daily average index commodity prices taken from Gas Daily for the appropriate geographic pricing regions, where the weights are computed based on actual purchases made during the month. The commodity index prices will be adjusted to include the appropriate maximum transportation commodity charges and fuel retention to the city gate.

;

To the extent that Nashville renegotiates existing reservation fee supply contracts or executes new reservation fee supply contracts with commodity pricing provisions at a discount to the first-of-the-month price index, Nashville shall modify the monthly commodity price index to reflect such discount

Because the aggregate maximum daily contract quantities in Nashville's FT contract portfolio vary by month over the course of the year, the weights will be recalculated each month to reflect actual contract demand quantities for such month. The contract weights, and potentially the price indices used, will also vary as Nashville renegotiates existing or adds new FT contracts. As new contracts are negotiated, Nashville shall modify the index to reflect actual contract demand quantities and the commodity price indices appropriate for the supply regions reached by such FT agreements

If the actual total commodity gas purchase cost in a month is within one percent of the benchmark dollar amount, there will be no incentive gains or losses. If the actual total commodity gas purchase cost varies from the benchmark dollar allowance by more than one percent, the variance in excess of the one percent threshold shall be deemed incentive gains or losses under the plan. Such gains or losses will be shared 50/50 between the Company and the ratepayers

# Gas Supply Reservation Fees

Nashville will continue to recover 100% of gas supply reservation fee costs through its PGA with no profit or loss potential. For new contracts and/or contracts subject to renegotiation during the Plan year, Nashville will solicit bids for gas supply contracts containing a reservation fee

# Off-System Sales And Sale For Resale Transactions

Margin on off-system sales and wholesale sale-for-resale transactions using Nashville's firm transportation and capacity entitlements (the costs of which are recovered from Nashville's ratepayers) shall be credited to the commodity gas cost component of the Gas Procurement Incentive Mechanism and will be shared with ratepayers Margin on such sales will be defined as the difference between the sales proceeds and the total variable costs incurred by Nashville in connection with the transaction, including transportation and gas costs, taxes, fuel, or other costs For purposes of gas costs, Nashville will impute such costs for its related supply purchases at the benchmark first-of-the-month or daily index, as appropriate, on the pipeline and in the zone in which the sale takes place The difference between Nashville's actual costs and such index price is taken into account under the Gas Procurement Incentive Mechanism As to transportation costs, Nashville will impute such costs up to the transporting pipeline's maximum interruptible transportation (IT) rate. The difference between the maximum IT rate and Nashville's actual transportation commodity costs will be treated as capacity release margin under the Capacity Management Incentive Mechanism After deducting the total transaction costs from the sales proceeds, any remaining margin will be credited to commodity gas costs and shared on a 50/50 basis with ratepayers

# Use Of Financial Instruments Or Other Private Contracts

To the extent Nashville uses futures contracts, financial derivative products, storage swap arrangements, or other private agreements to hedge, manage or reduce gas costs, any gains or losses will flow through the commodity cost component of the Gas Procurement Incentive Mechanism

# CAPACITY MANAGEMENT INCENTIVE MECHANISM

To the extent Nashville is able to release transportation or storage capacity, or generate transportation or storage margin associated with off-system or wholesale sales-for-resale, the associated cost savings shall be shared by Nashville and customers according to the following sharing formula

Capacity Management Incentive cost savings as a percent of Nashville's annual transportation and storage demand costs.	Sharing percentages Nashville/Customers (Percent)
Less than or equal to 1 percent	0/100
Greater than 1 percent but less than or equal to 2 percent	10/90
Greater than 2 percent but less than or equal to 3 percent	25/75
Greater than 3 percent	50/50

The sharing percentages shall be determined based on the actual demand costs incurred by Nashville (exclusive of credits for capacity release) for transportation and storage capacity during the plan year, as such costs may be adjusted due to refunds or surcharges from pipeline and storage suppliers. Any incentive gains or losses resulting from adjustments to the sharing percentages caused by refunds or surcharges shall be recorded in the current Incentive Plan Account (IPA).

# **DETERMINATION OF SHARED SAVINGS**

Each month during the term of plan, Nashville will compute any gains or losses in accordance with the plan. If Nashville earns a gain, a separate Incentive Plan Account (IPA) will be debited with such gain. If Nashville incurs a loss, that same IPA will be credited with such loss. During a plan year, Nashville will be limited to overall gains or losses totaling \$1.6 million. Interest shall be computed on balances in the IPA using the same interest rate and methods as used in Nashville's Actual Cost Adjustment (ACA) account. The offsetting entries to IPA gains or losses will be recorded to income or expense, as appropriate. At its option, however, Nashville may temporarily record any monthly gains in a non-regulatory deferred credit balance sheet account until results for the entire plan year are available.

Gains or losses accruing to the Company under the Plan will form the basis for a rate increment or decrement to be filed and placed into effect separate from any other rate adjustments to recover or refund such amount over a prospective twelve-month period

Each year, effective November 1, the rates for all customers, excluding interruptible transportation customers who receive no direct benefit from any gas cost reductions resulting from the plan, will be increased or decreased by a separate rate increment or decrement designed to amortize the collection or refund of the June 30 IPA balance

NASHVILLE GAS COMPANY
665 Mainstream Drive
Nashville, Tennessee 37228
A Division of Piedmont Natural Gas Company
TRA Service Schedule No 14

Original Sheet No 14 Page 6 of 6

)

over the succeeding twelve month period. The increment or decrement will be established by dividing the June 30 IPA balance by the appropriate volumetric billing determinants for the twelve months ended June 30. During the twelve month amortization period, the amount collected or refunded each month will be computed by multiplying the billed volumetric determinants for such month by the increment or decrement, as applicable. The product will be credited or debited to the IPA, as appropriate. The balance in the IPA will be tracked as a separate collection mechanism.

# FILING WITH THE AUTHORITY

The Company will file calculations of shared savings and shared costs quarterly with the Authority not later than 60 days after the end of each interim fiscal quarter and will file an annual report not later than 60 days following the end of each plan year Unless the Authority provides written notification to the Company within 180 days of such reports, the Incentive Plan Account shall be deemed in compliance with the provisions of this Service Schedule

# PERIODIC INDEX REVISIONS

Because of changes in the natural gas marketplace, the price indices utilized by the Company, and the composition of the Company's purchased gas portfolio may change The Company shall, within 30 days of identifying a change to a significant component of the mechanism, provide notice of such change to the Authority. Unless the Authority provides written justification to the Company within 30 days of such notice, the price indices shall be deemed approved as proposed by the Company

# GAS SUPPLY INCENTIVE COMPENSATION PROGRAM

The Company has in place a Gas Supply Incentive Compensation Program (the Program) designed to provide incentive compensation to selected Gas Supply non-executive employees involved in the implementation of the Nashville Incentive Plan and Secondary Marketing Programs in a manner consistent with the benefits achieved for customers and shareholders through improvements in gas procurement and secondary marketing activities. Participants in the program receive incentive compensation as recognition for their contribution to the customers and shareholders of the Company through lower gas costs and gains related thereto. Performance measures are established for the Program each year.

During the time this tariff is in effect, the Company will continue to have in place the Gas Supply Incentive Compensation Program, as detailed to the Authority, as it relates to the Nashville Incentive Plan The Company will advise the Authority in writing of any changes to the Program, and unless the Company is advised within 60 days, said changes will become effective No filing for prior approval is required for changes in the performance measures

# Attachment G

March 26, 2002

Mr Earl H Burton Manager – Marketing & Rates Chattanooga Gas Company 6125 Preservation Drive Chattanooga, TN 37416

Dear Mr Burton

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated February 28, 2002 enclosing a PGA/Tariff filing revision for Chattanooga Gas Company Certain amended pages were received on March 15, 2002. The tariff revisions were made to reflect the Company's current WACOG cost of storage gas. The Company has proposed to use this cost in place of the current NYMEX close for April 2002, in order to begin reducing the significant under-recovered balance in its deferred gas cost account. Also included in this filing is an IMCR refund consisting of Off-System Sales profits (50% of which is refunded to the customers), payments received through the Company's Asset Management Agreement, and the balance of the prior 99-00 IMCR filing. I have reviewed this filing and it appears to be correct. The rates are approved to be effective on April 1, 2002.

For future reference, this PGA/Tariff filing is logged as number 02-00229 Please refer to this number in any correspondence regarding this particular filing

Sincerely,

Pat Murphy
Senior Financial Analyst
Energy and Water Division

cc Dan McCormac
Archie Hickerson

РМ02-16сдерда

# Attachment H

### **Archie Hickerson**

From Pat Murphy [Pat Murphy@state tn us]
Sent Monday, June 30, 2003 11 12 AM

To Archie Hickerson
Cc Mike Gaines
Subject Tariff filing



pm03-39 cgctariff d oc (27 KB)

Archie,

Attached is a Staff data request pertaining to your recent tariff filing for a revision of Chattanooga Gas Tariff No 1, Sixth Revised Sheet No 48 The original will be mailed today The request has been assigned a tariff no 03-00408 Please respond as soon as possible

Thanks, Pat

# TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Sara Kyle, Chairman
Deborah Taylor Tate, Director
Pat Miller, Director
Ron Jones, Director



460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505

June 30, 2003

Mr Archie R Hickerson Manager - Rates Atlanta Gas Light Company Location 1686 P O Box 4569 Atlanta, GA 30302-4569

RE Revision to Chattanooga Gas Tariff No 1 – Sixth Revised Sheet No 48 Tariff Filing No 03-00408

Dear Mr Hickerson

To clarify Chattanooga's request for a revision to its tariff as referenced above, pertaining to the language in its Interruptible Margin Credit Rider, please provide answers to the following questions Please respond to this data request by July 14, 2003

- Please explain the types of non-sales transactions, other than off-system sales, that the tariff is referring to
- What gas supply assets are utilized in the Company's transactions with nonjurisdictional customers?
- When did the Company first become involved in transactions other than offsystem sales?
- Does Chattanooga still have an Asset Management Agreement with its affiliate (Sequent Energy Management) for the management of its gas supply assets? If so, how will the change in tariff language affect this agreement?
- If there is still an Asset Management Agreement currently in effect between Chattanooga and Sequent, please provide a copy of the agreement
- If Sequent is still managing Chattanooga's gas supply assets, how will the new tariff language benefit Sequent? How will it benefit the customers of Chattanooga?

Please quantify the benefits to Chattanooga's customers under the new tariff language, as compared to the \$300,000 payment from Sequent under the Asset Management Agreement What would the benefit have been during the calendar year 2002? What is it projected to be during the calendar year 2003?

If you have any questions regarding this request, you can contact me at (615) 741-2904, extension 178

Sincerely,

Pat Mengley Pat Murphy

Senior Financial Analyst Energy and Water Division

cc

ì

Mike Gaines
Dan McCormac

PM03-39 cgctarift

# Attachment I

#### **Archie Hickerson**

From Archie Hickerson

**Sent** Thursday, July 10, 2003 11 37 AM

To 'Pat Murphy@state tn us'
Cc 'Mike Gaines@state tn us'

Subject Response to June 30n Data Request Tariff Filing 03-00408

Pat,

Attached are CGC's response to your June 30,2003 data request in reference to Tariff Filing 03-00408. The Company considers the response to question 7 confidential and request that it not be made public. I have included two versions of the response. One with the confidential portion deleted (Public Copy) and one that includes the confidential data (Confidential Copy).

I am also sending a hard copy by mail



# Chattanooga Gas Company / 2207 Olan Mills Drive/ Chattanooga TN 37421 Telephone 1-800-427-5463

July 10, 2003

Ms Pat Murphy, Senior Financial Analylst Energy and Water Division Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville TN 37243-0505

RE Revision to Chattanooga Gas Tariff No 1-Sixth Revised Sheet No 48 Tariff Filing No 03-00408

Dear Mr Gaines,

Attached are Chattanooga Gas Company's responses to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority Staff's June 30, 2003 Data Request in Tariff Filing No 03-00408

We are requesting that the estimated sharing for calendar year 2003 as presented in response to question # 7 be treated as confidential I will provide both a proprietary and a non proprietary version of the response

If you have any question, please call me at 404 584 3855

Sincerely

Archie R Hickerson Manager - Rates

Cc Mike Gaines
Dan McCormac

# 1. Please explain the types of non-sales transactions, other than off-system sales, that the tariff is referring to.

One example of a "non-sales transaction" would involve Chattanooga Gas Company (CGC) through Sequent, acting as agent, entering into a contract to deliver gas to a non-jurisdictional customer, as defined in our tariff, several months in the future. Simultaneously with its commitment for future deliveries, Sequent will purchase a financial instrument in the form of a futures contract which "locks-in" or should insure a profit on that future sale, which is subject to sharing

Another example involves the use of CGC's capacity rights on an interstate pipeline in a segmented manner. Although the use of these capacity rights involve the sale of gas off-system (at points other than the city gate) it is the enhanced use/optimization of the transportation which creates the opportunity to these transactions and value to CGC.

2. What gas supply assets are utilized in the Company's transactions with non-jurisdictional customers?

The assets involved are primarily the Company's interstate pipeline transportation and storage contracts, and its LNG facility

# 3. When did the Company first become involved in transactions other than offsystem sales?

In 2001, AGL Resources ("AGLR"), the parent company of Chattanooga Gas Company, created Sequent Energy Management, L P ("Sequent"), which is a gas asset optimization and wholesale services company. One of Sequent's functions is to centrally manage the gas supply assets of CGC and AGLR's other regulated affiliates in Georgia and Virginia.

During the 2001 time frame, it became apparent opportunities existed to engage in transactions, as discussed in item 1 above, that were not traditional off-system sales subject to sharing under the current CGC tariff that was implemented in 1986. In exchange for the opportunity to act as agent for CGC and optimize CGC's regulated assets in non-jurisdictional transactions, Sequent entered into an asset management agreement "Gas Storage Asset Bailment Agreement" with CGC that provided CGC's customers with a guaranteed annual payment of \$300,000 as a replacement for the traditional 50/50 sharing arrangement. Prior to the 2001 agreement, CGC customers had received \$103,000 for the twelve months ended June 1999 and \$212,000 for the twelve months ended June 2000

Recently Atlanta Gas Light Company (AGLC) entered into an agreement with the Georgia Public Service Commission that provides for 50/50 sharing of the net gain from AGLC's asset management agreement. We have tracked the sharing and believe this sharing arrangement provides more benefits for the customers

4. Does Chattanooga still have an Asset Management Agreement with its affiliate (Sequent Energy Management) for the management of its gas supply assets? If so, how will the change in tariff language affect this agreement?

Yes The agreement will be modified to reflect the 50/50 sharing of net margin on all non-jurisdictional transactions

5. If there is still an Asset Management Agreement currently in effect between Chattanooga and Sequent, please provide a copy of the agreement.

A <u>proprietary</u> copy of the "Gas Storage Asset Bailment Agreement" was included as an exhibit to the Securities and Exchange Commission Form U-9C-3 for the Quarter Ended March 31, 2003 that was filed with the TRA

6. If Sequent is still managing Chattanooga's gas supply assets, how will the new tariff language benefit Sequent? How will it benefit the customers of Chattanooga?

Sequent will benefit by having all three jurisdictions (Tennessee, Georgia, and Virginia) on very similar sharing plans thus simplifying accounting and transaction tracking

The new tariff language will insure that CGC's customers will not only continue to receive credits that results from gains on the traditional off-system sales, but will receive 50% of the net margin on other transactions that utilize CGC's gas supply assets

7. Please quantify the benefits to Chattanooga's customers under the new tariff language, as compared to the \$300,000 payment from Sequent under the Asset Management Agreement. What would the benefit have been during the calendar year 2002? What is it projected to be during the calendar year 2003?

We can not, with any precision, quantify for calendar year 2002 what the effect of the tariff change would be However since the proposed tariff language includes all transactions, it is assumed the benefit to CGC's customer would be at least as much as they would have received otherwise

The Company has accounted for sharing under the proposed tariff language since January 1, 2003 Because of the volatility associated with the gas market this year, it is roughly estimated that sharing may be as great as **\$(Proprietary)** on an annual basis. However, the actual amount is dependent on the volatility of the market during the remaining six months

# Attachment J

# Performance-Based Ratemaking

#### **Applicability**

This Performance-Based Ratemaking Mechanism (PBRM) is designed to encourage the utility to maximize its gas purchasing activities at minimum cost consistent with efficient operations and service reliability. Each plan year will begin July 1. The annual provision and filings herein will apply to this annual period. The PBRM will continue until it is either (a) terminated at the end of a plan year or by not less than 90 days notice by the Company to the Authority or (b) modified, amended or terminated by the Authority

#### **Overview of Structure**

The Performance-Based Ratemaking Mechanism establishes predefined monthly benchmark indexes to which the Company's commodity cost is compared

### Benchmark Index

Each month, Chattanooga will compare its actual commodity cost of gas to the appropriate benchmark amount. The benchmark gas cost will be computed by multiplying actual purchase quantities for the month, including quantities purchased for injection into storage, by the appropriate benchmark price index.

#### Spot Market Purchases

The monthly spot market benchmark is the "Index" price published in the first issue of the delivery month of *Inside FERC's Gas Market Report* in the table titled "Price of Spot Gas Delivered to Pipelines," denoted in the column labeled "Index" and the row for the applicable "Pricing Point"

#### Swing Purchases

For swing purchases, the benchmark "Index" price for gas delivered on any day upon which Gas Daily is published, is equal to the Gas Daily-Midpoint price for the immediately following day under the heading "Daily Price Survey" For gas delivered on Saturday, Sunday, or any other day upon which Gas Daily is not published, the price index is equal to the Daily-Midpoint for the nearest subsequent day published by Gas Daily

#### Long-term purchases

For long term purchases, 1 e, a term more than one month, the "Index" price published in the first issue of the delivery month of *Inside FERC's Gas Market Report* in the table titled "Price of Spot Gas Delivered to Pipelines" denoted in the column labeled "Index" and the row for the applicable "Pricing Point" will be adjusted for the Company's rolling three-year average premium paid to ensure long-term supply availability during peak periods

#### City Gate Purchases

For city gate purchases where gas is delivered by the supplier to the local distribution company, the indexes will be adjusted for the avoided transportation costs that would have been paid if the upstream capacity were purchased versus the demand charges actually paid to the supplier

#### **Performance-Based Ratemaking**

### Performance-Based Ratemaking (Continued)

#### **Prudence Determination**

If Chattanooga's total commodity gas cost for the plan year does not exceed the total benchmark amount by one percentage points (1%) during a plan year ending after June 30, 2000, Chattanooga's gas cost will be deemed prudent and the audit required by Tennessee Regulatory Authority's Administrative Rule 1220-4-7- 05 is waived. If during any month of the plan year, the Company's commodity gas cost exceed the benchmark amount by greater than two percentage points (2%), the Company shall file a report with the Authority fully explaining why the cost exceeded the benchmark

#### Filing with the Authority

The Company will file an annual report not later than 60 days following the end of each plan year identifying the actual cost of gas purchased and the applicable index for each month of the plan year

Unless the Authority provides written notification to the Company within 180 days of such reports, the annual filing shall be deemed in compliance with the provisions of this Service Schedule

#### **Periodic Index Revisions**

Because of changes in the natural gas marketplace, the price indices used by Chattanooga, and the composition of Chattanooga's purchased gas portfolio may change The Company shall, within 30 days of identifying a change to a significant component of the mechanism, provide notice of such change to the Authority Unless the Authority provides written notice to Chattanooga within 30 days of the Company's notice to the Authority, the price indices shall be deemed approved as proposed by the Company

# Attachment K



From. Sent

Pat Murphy [Pat Murphy@state tn us] Wednesday, April 07, 2004 12 32 PM

To Subject Archie Hickerson RE Staff Data Request (03-00516)

Archie,

I think Randal is on board with getting a protective order I'll keep you advised

Pat

>>> "Archie Hickerson" <ahickers@aglresources com> 4/7/2004 9  $00\cdot24$  AM >>>

Pat,

Does the TRA have an Attorney General's Opinion that the TRA Staff's workpapers are not subject to the open records act? When I was at the Public Service Commission, I was told that our workpapers were not protected? Can we get a protective order protecting the documents?

----Original Message---From Pat Murphy [mailto Pat Murphy@state tn us]
Sent Wednesday, April 07, 2004 9 55 AM
To Archie Hickerson
Cc Randal Gilliam
Subject Staff Data Request (03-00516)

Archie,

In its response to Staff Data Request dated February 25, 2004, question no 1, the Company stated that copies of the un-redacted invoices would be made available for TRA Staff review at its attorney's office in Nashville — That is unacceptable to the Staff — These un-redacted invoices must be provided to Staff as requested — If the Company wishes to send them labelled as "Confidential," that is acceptable, but they will become part of the Staff's workpapers

I wanted to make you aware that if the information is not provided, the issue may rise to a higher level. For instance, it could be cited as a scope limitation in the audit and Staff would not be able to provide assurance to the Authority that the Company is in compliance with the PGA Rule

Please let me know by tomorrow how the Company wishes to handle this issue

Thanks, Pat

# Attachment L

## **Archie Hickerson**

From Sent

Pat Murphy [Pat Murphy@state tn us] Thursday, April 15, 2004 3 08 PM

To Cc Archie Hickerson

Subject

Hal Novak, Randal Gilliam CGC ACA data request

Archie,

I spoke with Randal yesterday afternoon regarding the alternatives for Staff getting the un-redacted invoices for Sequent I thought a protective order was a viable option But now Randal says it is not His reason being this is not a contested case

The only options he can offer are a confidentiality agreement between the Company and Staff, whereby nothing would be put on the internet and the Company would be notified if anyone made a request to see the documents. I don't think this would work, because how would it be enforced? There is no guarantee that a request would be made thru me or that I would be here down the line when a request is made. You need to remember that since this is a data request for a compliance audit, the data requests are not placed into the Authority's docket file and are not scanned on the internet. They are kept with Staff's workpapers in a secure location. However, they are subject to the open records act But the risk is minimal that anyone outside of Staff would ever know they existed

Randal's second option is a subpoena I don't think anyone wants to go there, but if it's the only way, he may decide to

My own third option is to make this a Company imposed scope limitation to the audit in my report — In that case, I could not provide an opinion to the Directors whether or not the Company is in compliance with the terms of the PGA Rule

I think this is your final answer Please let me know soon what the Company wants to do If you want to talk more about it, give me a call

Pat

### Attachment M



6125 Preservation Drive Chattanooga, TN 37416 Telephone (423) 490-4302 November 17, 2000

Ms Pat Murphy Rate Analyst Energy and Water Division Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville TN 37243-0505

Dear Ms Murphy,

Pursuant to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority's Rules and Regulations, Chattanooga Gas Company hereby files two (2) *revised* copies of the following revisions to Chattanooga Gas Tariff No. 1

Fifty-ninth Revised Sheet No 53 Fifty-seventh Revised Sheet No 55

We request that the TRA withdraw the original filing dated November 1, 2000, and replace with this revised filing. The attached revised filing reflects the most recent gas prices which have increased substantially since the original filing date. The revised filing will better reflect the Company's gas costs, and avoid an under-collection of gas costs attributable to a very volatile gas market. We propose that this Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) rate filing become effective December 1, 2000

The current filing also includes the following surcharge/refunds that we propose to make effective for December 1, 2000

- 1 Allocation of ACA 1999-2000 surcharge
- 2 Supplier Refund, (Refund outstanding balance of \$321,011)
- 3 IMCR Refund, (Refund outstanding balance of \$931,099)

Historically, the Interruptible Margin Credit Rider, IMCR, has been used to recover margin losses from negotiated rates, and to refund 50% of off-system sales revenues to customers. The provisions of this rider allowed the Company to recover all gross margin losses from the firm commodity component of gas costs. In recent filings, the Company has elected to recover SS-1 margin losses through the ACA filing, subsequently, the main purpose of the IMCR filing has in effect changed from it's original intent in that the filing provides for significant refunds to the Company's customers. Additionally, since most of the Company's off-system sales revenues are derived from assets that are paid for through the demand component of the firm gas costs, the Company maintains that it is more appropriate to credit off-system sales revenues to the demand cost component of gas costs. This ensures that customer's paying for these assets are receiving benefit from the Company's prudent management of these assets

Page 2 Ms Pat Murphy

The ACA filing includes an outstanding WNA Recovery for the 1997-1998 year in the amount of \$102,283 This WNA under-recovery has not been recovered through a PGA filing. Should there be any questions, I will be glad to discuss, or you may contact Earl Burton at (423) 490-4311

Sincerely,

Chattanooga Gas Company

By William H. Novak

**Enclosures** 

C Mr Dan McCormac

Mr. Earl Burton

Mr Amanda Hwang

CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY COMPUTATION OF CURRENT COST OF GAS BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDED

PGA Filing Effective Date December 1, 2000

FIRM COST (D)

		Total		Number	
	Current	Volume	Monthly	of	
<u>Supplier</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>TQ</u>	<u>Charge</u>	<u>Months</u>	Gas Cost
TENNESSEE					
FT Reservation Charge	\$5 61000	39,792	\$223,233	12	\$2,678,796
FS Storage - Production Area - Deliverabilit	\$2 02000	13,659	\$27,591	12	\$331.092
FS Storage - Production Area - Space	\$0 02480	2,042,390	\$50,651	12	\$607,812
FS Storage - Market Area - Deliverability	\$1 17000	7,741	\$9,057	12	\$108.684
FS Storage - Market Area - Space	\$0 01870	852,287	\$15,938	12	\$191,256
EAST TENNESSEE					
FT-A Demand	\$7 39000	46,350	\$342,527	12	\$4,110,324
CNG GSS Storage - Demand	\$1 83440	2,483	\$4,555	12	\$54.660
CNG GSS Storage - Capacity	\$0 01340	151,974	\$2,036	12	\$24,432
SOUTHERN					
FT Reservation Charge	\$11 28470	13,221	\$149,195	12	\$1,790,340
FT-NN Reservation Charge	\$11 28470	14,346	\$161.890	12	\$1,942,680
CSS Storage - Deliverability	\$1 54400	14,346	\$22,150	12	\$265,800
CSS Storage - Capacity	\$0 02834	710,484	\$20,135	12	\$241,620
TOTAL FIRM COST					\$12,347,496

September 30, 2000

#### COMMODITY COST (P)

Supplier		Current <u>Rate</u>	Annual <u>MCF</u>	Company <u>Use</u>	Total MCF <u>Available</u>	Current Annual Gas Cost
EAST TENNESSEE						
FT	(a)	\$6 31512	5,927,023	(4,086)	5,922,937	\$37,404,073
FS Storage Injection	(a)(c)	\$6 11448	(1,762,097)	1,215	(1,760,882)	
FS Storage Withdrawal	(a)	\$3 98983	1,372,044	(946)	1,371,098	\$5,470,448
CNG Storage Injection	(a)(c)	\$6 11448	(74,608)	51	(74,557)	
CNG Storage Withdrawal	(a)	\$3 73257	133,922	(92)	133,830	\$499,530
TOTAL EAST TENNESSEE			5,596,284	(3,858)		\$32,151,304
SOUTHERN						
FT	(b)	\$6 05873	5,335,856	(3,678)	E 222 470	£33,300,040
IT and Purchase of End-User Ga		\$3 75000	119,503	(82)	,	\$32,306,249
CSS Storage Injection	(b)(c)	\$5 91041	(371,767)	256	119,421	\$447,829
CSS Storage Withdrawal	(b)	\$3 33226	823,810		(371,511)	(, _, ,, ,,
TOTAL SOUTHERN	(5)	45 55220	5,907,402	( <u>568)</u>	823,242	\$2,743,258
			3,507,402	(4,072)	5,903,330	\$33,301,554
LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS						
Liquefaction and Turbine Fuel	(a)	\$6 31512	(474,845)		(474,845)	(\$2,998,704)
Boiloff and Vaporization	(d)	\$4 51793	1.105.113		1.105,113	\$4,992,820
TOTAL LNG			630,268		630,268	\$1,994,116
			.,		300,200	\$1,554,110
TOTAL COMMODITY COST  Average Commodity Cost Per MCF			12,133,954	(7,930)	12,126,024	\$67,446,974
A Column Color Per MCF						\$5 56217

**TOTAL COST** 

\$79,794,470

<sup>1 036</sup> BTU adjustment included in above ETNG rates

<sup>1 008</sup> BTU adjustment included in above SNG rates

<sup>(</sup>c WACOG of ET and SNG purchases excl transportation rate Detail - page 3

<sup>(</sup>d Based on LNG "LIFO" Cost / MCF Detail - page 2

Page 2

DETAIL OF RATES USED TO COMPUTE PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT EFFECTIVE

December 1, 2000

MCF VOLUMES FOR LNG AND COMPANY USE / GAS INTO AND OUT OF LNG PLANT FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDED

September 30, 2000

#### QUEFIED NATURAL GAS

				ETNG/Spot	Turbine						Less			Net
1	MCF Liquefie	Turbine	CF Liquefied	Commodity	Fuel	Total Cost	Total		Co		Vapor	Net		(To)/From
Month	(Into Tank)	Fuel	+Turbine Fuel	WACOG/Mc	+ 6% Tax	w/o Tax	Cost	Rate	Use	Boil-Off	Fuel	Boil-Off	Vaporized	Plant
Jan 00		0	0			\$0	\$0		(383)	25,512	3,974	21,538	132,472	154,010
Feb 00	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(533)	19,849	8,842	11,007	284,606	295,613
Mar 00	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(528)	23,627	0	23,627	0	23,627
Apr 00	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(441)	25,435	0	25,435	0	25,435
May 00	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(1,042)	16,131	0	16,131	0	16,131
June 00	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(610)	15,362	0	15,362	0	15,362
Jul 00	0	0	0	\$0 00000	\$0 00000	\$0	\$0		(768)	33,129	0	33,129	242,928	276,057
Aug 00	164,309	48,068	212,377	\$3 82000	\$4 04920	\$811,280	\$822,297		(744)	21,686	4,229	17,457	140,955	(53,965)
Sep 00	183,458	79,010	262,468	\$4 62000	\$4 89720	\$1,212,602	\$1,234,504		(753)	30,539	0	30,539	0	(231,929)
Oct 99	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(559)	21,978	0	21,978	0	21,978
Nov 99	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(832)	22,470	0	22,470	0	22,470
Dec 99	0	0	0			\$0	\$0		(737)	25,260	1,244	24,016	41,463	65,479
TOTAL	347,767	127,078	474,845	\$4 26220	\$4 51793	\$2,023,882	\$2,056,801	\$4 51793	(7,930)	280,978	18,289	262,689	842,424	630,268

CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY
DETAIL OF RATES USED TO COMPUTE PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT
EFFECTIVE.
December 1, 2000

TENNESSEE NATURAL	GAS COMPANY
-------------------	-------------

	DT	RATE	TOTAL
FIRM TRANSPORTATION (FT)			
Reservation Charges - Supplier 1	205,808	\$0,0000	\$0
Supplier 2	425,326	\$0.01000	\$4,253
Supplier 3	0	\$0,00000	\$0
TGP Commodity - Supplier 1	0	\$0.00000	\$0
Supplier 2	433,721	\$5 79800	\$2,514,714
SPOT Commodity - Supplier 1	16,549	\$5.79800	\$95,951
Supplier 2	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Total	450,270	\$5 80744	\$2,614,918
TGP Fuel	(7,655)		
TGP Transport	442,615	\$0 06211	\$27,491
Total TGP	442,615	\$5 96999	\$2,642,409
ET - Supplier 1 - Reservation Charges	4,978	\$7 58000	\$37,733
ET - Supplier 1 - Commodity	154,318	\$5 79800	\$894,736
Total	154,318		\$932,469
Total TGP and ET	596,933	\$5 98874	\$3,574,878
ETN Fuel	(9,432)		
ETN Transport	587,502	\$0 01080	\$6,345
Rate/MMBTU	587,502	\$6 09568	\$3,581,223
Rate/MCF		\$6.31512	
FS STORAGE INJECTION			
Total Purchases	450,270	\$5 80744	\$2,614,918
Fuel	(6,709)		
Injection Charge	443,561	\$0.00672	\$2,981
Rate/MMBTU	443,561	\$5 90200	\$2,617,899
Rate/MCF		\$6.11448	
SOUTHERN NATURAL GAS COMPANY			
FIDM TRANSPORTATION (FF	DT	RATE	TOTAL
FIRM TRANSPORTATION (FT)  Reservation Charges - Supplier 1			
	312,117	\$0 01500	\$4,682
Supplier 2	0	\$0 01000	\$0
Supplier 3 Commodity - Supplier 1	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 2	318,277	\$5 79800	\$1,845,370
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Total	0	\$0.00000	\$0
Fuel	318,277	\$5 81271	\$1,850,052
Transport	(8,275) 310,002	£0.04000	•
Rate/MMBTU	310,002	\$0.04280	\$13,268
Rate/MCF	310,002	\$6.05873	\$1,863,320
CSS STORAGE INJECTION			
Total Purchases	240 077	AF 04074	
Fuel @ .76%	318,277	\$5 81271	\$1,850,052
Injection Charge	(2,419) 315 858	£0.00000	**
Rate/MMBTU	315,858 315,858	\$0 00630	\$1,990
Rate/MCF	313,030	\$5.86353 \$5.91041	\$1,852,042
		\$5.91041	

DETAIL OF RATES USED TO COMPUTE INTERRUPTIBLE PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT EFFECTIVE: December 1, 2000

#### TENNESSEE NATURAL GAS COMPANY

	DT	RATE	TOTAL
INTERRUPTIBLE TRANSPORTATION (IT)			
Reservation Charges - Supplier 1	205,808	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 2	425,326	\$0 01000	\$4,253
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
TGP Commodity - Supplier 1	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 2	433,721	\$5 79800	\$2,514,714
SPOT Commodity - Supplier 1	16,549	\$5 79800	\$95,951
Supplier 2	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Total	450,270	\$5 80744	\$2,614,918
TGP Fuel	(7,655)		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
TGP IT Transport	442,615	\$0 26940	\$119,241
Total TGP	442,615	\$6 17728	\$2,734,159
ET - Supplier 1 - Reservation Charges	4,978	\$7 58000	\$37,733
ET - Supplier 1 - Commodity	154,318	\$5 79800	\$894,736
Total	154,318	,	\$932,469
Total TGP and ET	596,933	\$6 14244	\$3,666,628
ETN Fuel	(9,432)	,	70,000,020
ETN INT Transport	587,502	\$0 24780	\$145,583
Rate/MMBTU	587,502	\$6 48885	\$3,812,211
Rate/MCF	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$6.72245	7-11-11

SOUTHERN NATURAL GAS COMPANY			
	DT	RATE	TOTAL
INTERRUPTIBLE TRANSPORTATION (IT)			701712
Reservation Charges - Supplier 1	312,117	\$0 01500	\$4,682
Supplier 2	0	\$0 01000	\$0
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Commodity - Supplier 1	318,277	\$5 79800	\$1,845,370
Supplier 2	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Supplier 3	0	\$0 00000	\$0
Total	318,277	\$5 81271	\$1,850,052
Fuel	(8,275)		. ,,
SNG INT Transport	310,002	\$0 39780	\$123,319
Rate/MMBTU	310,002	\$6.36568	\$1,973,371
Rate/MCF		\$6.41657	
TOTAL SYSTEM VOLUMES	897,504		
WEIGHTED SYSTEM INT RATE/DT WEIGHTED SYSTEM INT RATE/MCF	897,504	\$6.4463	\$5,785,582
THE STOTEMENT RATEMOR	874,019	<b>\$</b> 6.6195	

#### Samson expands B.C. footprint

Samson Canada will acquire from Petro Canada oil and gas properties in Northeast British Columbia for \$C90 million. The sale is expected to close by the end of the year.

The properties are concentrated in the Buick Creek, Fireweed and Fort St. John areas and produce about 15 million cfd of gas.

"This acquisition is an excellent fit with the properties Samson recently obtained from its corporate acquisition of Calahoo Petroleum this past spring," said Rob Bilger, Samson chief financial officer. Samson's focus, he said, is on developing core areas in northeast B.C. and northwest Alberta.

#### FUTURES NYMEX @ Henry Hub

<b></b>	R	eaults from	Thursda	v	
	æment	High	Low C	hange	Volume
Dec., 2000		6.120	5 785	-46 7	57,895
Jan., 2001	5 788	6 100	5 780	44.3	21,416
February	5.511	5 720	5.511	-30 0	8,441
March	5 051	5.300	5 051	-30.0	8,198
April	4 610	0.480	4 625	-28.3	3,175
May	4 465	4.665	4.460	-26 3	1,640
June	4.445	4.630	4 450	-26 1	2.994
July	4.435	4 620	4.405	-26.1	1.096
August	4 430	4 630	4.390	-26.0	1.039
September		4.600	4.380	-25.5	524
October	4.405	4.590	4 360	-25.5	4,042
November	4 495	4.680	4 480	-24.5	1,883
December	4 590	4.780	4 590	-22 8	368
Jen., 2002	4.585	4 740	4 600	-22.3	673
February March	4 405	—	_	-20 7	15
April	4.240	4.240	4.240	-19.7	345
May	4.015	4.000	4 000	-190	8
June	3 975	_	-	-19.0	55
July	3 965	_	_	-18 O	55
August	3 981		_	-180	5
September	3.986	4 066	3.945	-180	30
October	4.001	-	_	-18.0	5
November	4.006 4.121		_	-170	115
December		4.116	4.116	-16.5	428
Jan., 2003	4 222 4.227	4.217	4.217	-16.5	3,221
February		4.212	4.212	-15.5	22
March	4.053 3.883			-155	o i
April		3.900	3.690	-15.5	3,370
May	3.721 3.695			-15.5	0
June	3.715	3.700	3.700	-14.5	25
July	3.730	_	-	-14.0	0
August	3.730	_	_	-13 B	0
September	3.750	-	_	-13 B	0
October	3.760	_	_	-13.4	0
November	3.885	_	_	-129	Ō
Volume of co	9.003 Maria		-	-12,9	0
Front-months	TODAS H	(nuomicial)		12	21,083
Danie III	- shau u	лацеег МӨД	needay:		

Front-months open interest Wednesday:
December, 46,399; January, 44,583; February, 31,244
Total open interest Wednesday: 400,733
Weighted average of a number of trades in the last two minutes of trading. Change is from previous settlement price.

#### OPTIONS NYMEX@Henry Hub

Strike	_	Result	T mort	rureday			
	C	FILE-R-60	Je e		uts-Set	He	
Price	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Dec.			
5.80	68.0e				Jan.	Feb.	
5.65	00.04		80.5¢	16.8€	42.7a	76.0€	
	-	_	58.5€	10.9€	45.34		
5 70	40.0c		57.0e			_	
5.75	41.0¢	_		21.1¢	48 0¢	-	
5.80		_	55.2¢	23.5€	60.7e	_	
	25.9€	52.5e	53.64	26.1¢		_	
5.85	23.6€	50.46		20.15	53.5¢	_	
5.90			52.0¢		_	_	
	21.5¢	48.4€	50.4e	28.0∉		_	
<b>5.95</b>	19.5e			20.05	_	_	
6.00	17.6e	44.6-		_	-	_	
		44.6¢	47.56	32.0c	51.0e		
Control	ea Aoinw	e: Calia: :	n/a Pun			_	
Estimated Volume: Calls: n/a Pubs: n/a Total open Interest Wednesday Calls: 366,435 Puts: 375,447 Not all strike and selflement interest							
Not all	tirike and	11000	voy care	: 366,43	5 Puts: 37	75.447	
101 650 1	HING WING	sememe.	asona fr	<b>Estart</b>		-,,,,,	
Calls: &	4 01W D.	- 04 04	ilizarah i	виже рл	CO .		
	4.91% Pu	14.04.03	プラ ごうりいて	9: Bloom	nham		

TotalFinaElf to link with deepwater production

TotalFinaElf has launched work on a gas gathering system project in the deepwater Gulf of

otalFinaElf has launched work on a gas gathering system project in the deepwater Gulf of Mexico that will enable the development of three fields in the Mississippi Canyon offshore zone.

The fields, Aconcagua, King's Peak and Camden Hills, are located about 120 miles southeast of New Orleans in water depths ranging from 6,700 to 7,300 feet. The depths will set a new record for commercial production water depths, the company said.

In 2001, the company plans to install a dual 12-inch gathering line with a capacity of up to 500 million cfd. The gathering line will collect gas from the three fields and carry it to a new platform called Canyon Station, which will be installed 55 miles north of Camden Hills on Block MP 261 The station will be owned and operated by a unit of Williams.

Canyon Station will be connected to three pipelines to deliver gas onshore, giving Canyon Express producers access to a variety of markets.

The Canyon Express gathering system will be operated by TotalFinaElf affiliate Elf Exploration and owned by the owners of the three gas fields. Owners include Pioneer Natural Resources USA, BP, Elf Exploration, Marathon Oil, Mariner Energy and TotalFinaElf affiliate Total Exploration Production USA.

For the engineering, construction and installation of the system, Elf Exploration has created an integrated project team, including personnel from BP and Marathon Oil. The Canyon Express system is expected to start up in summer 2002.

## FERC OKs Tuscarora lateral to Sierra Pacific

ERC this week granted Tuscarora Gas Transmission permission to build a 16.4-mile lateral pipeline and other facilities that would deliver 10,000 dth/d to Sierra Pacific Power. The lateral and related facilities will cost an estimated \$10.2 million

In its application, Tuscarora indicated Sierra Pacific would pay the effective firm transportation rate throughout the 15-year term of the agreement.

Tuscarora also revealed that Sierra Pacific needed the added capacity to meet a projected increase in demand among its customers, particularly in the northern and western portions of its system. Sierra Pacific's customer base has grown at an average annual increase of 4.6% during the past three years, and without the creation of a new citygate in Lemmon Valley, Tuscarora said Sierra Pacific would be hindered in its efforts to meet increased demand. Sierra Pacific serves about 110,000 gas utility customers.

The 16-inch pipeline, dubbed the Hungry Valley Lateral, will run from Tuscarora's mainline milepost 205.5 to a newly constructed citygate in Lemmon Valley, Nev. Tuscarora's primary receipt point for the firm transportation service is an interconnection with PG&E Gas Transmission – Northwest, near Malin, Ore. The two operators recently inked an agreement, increasing by 125 psig the minimum average delivery pressure to Tuscarora.

A 10-year cost-of-service study provided to FERC by Tuscarora shows incremental revenues from the project would exceed expenses by more than \$4.8 million. That finding, along with firm service agreements that demonstrate full subscription of firm transportation capacity, meet FERC's threshold for allowing rolled-in rate treatment for the project.

The pipeline operator applied in May to build the lateral, requesting a FERC decision by Sept. 1 with hopes of having the line in place by November, thereby minimizing service interruptions during the colder months of December through February.

Review by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), however, slowed the timing of the FERC order, said Greg Galbraith, director of marketing and transportation at Tuscarora. "I'm disappointed [the order] came so slowly, but I wouldn't put that on FERC," Galbraith said. "The BLM took longer than we anticipated. FERC has been very supportive."

FERC concluded that Tuscarora's only competitor, Painte Pipeline, would not be adversely affected. "Painte's facilities are not proximate to the area of [Sierra Pacific's] needs and, in any event, are fully subscribed and therefore cannot economically address [Sierra Pacific's] capacity or supply problems," the order said.

The Nov. 13 order does include environmental mitigation conditions that could further delay construction. Tuscarora now expects the BLM to authorize further treatment to seven sites before the project can proceed. "We hope to start construction the last week of November," Galbraith said

Construction is expected to take six to eight weeks.

## CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY ANALYSIS OF AVERAGE STORAGE COST TWELVE MONTHS ENDE September 30, 2000

TOD	EC F	A /B # A	#3947	#2000
168	F 22-F	'A/MA	#3947	#3999

MMBtu Inj.	Rate	Cost
46,884	\$2 44753	\$114,750
20,231	\$2 69060	\$54,433
132,454	\$2 74756	\$363,925
97,551	\$3 00827	\$293,460
74,492	\$3 22602	\$240,313
78,703	\$4 51393	\$355,260
349,959	\$4 37192	\$1,529,992
270,965	\$3 54731	\$961,196
252,779	\$5 21418	\$1,318,034
69,427	\$2 62111	\$181,976
33,693	\$3 15190	\$106,197
20,132	\$2 20768	\$44,445
1,447,270	\$3 84447	\$5,563,981
rge	\$0 00672	
	\$3 85119	
	\$3.98983	
	46,884 20,231 132,454 97,551 74,492 78,703 349,959 270,965 252,779 69,427 33,693 20,132 1,447,270	46,884 \$2 44753 20,231 \$2 69060 132,454 \$2 74756 97,551 \$3 00827 74,492 \$3 22602 78,703 \$4 51393 349,959 \$4 37192 270,965 \$3 54731 252,779 \$5 21418 69,427 \$2 62111 33,693 \$3 15190 20,132 \$2 20768 1,447,270 \$3 84447 ge \$0 00672 \$3 85119

	ETNG GSS/CNG			SNG CSS			
	MMBtu Inj	Rate	Cost	MMBtu Inj Rate Cost			
Jan 00	0		\$0	10,326 \$2 42872 \$25,079			
Feb 00	0		\$0	24,909 \$2,70288 \$67,326			
Mar 00	0		\$0	39,658 \$2 69693 \$106,955			
Apr 00	0		\$0	131,030 \$2,99863 \$392,911			
May 00	0		\$0	34,522 \$3.18139 \$109,828			
June 00	0		\$0	73,654 \$4 46621 \$328,955			
Jul 00	20,747	\$4 44749	\$92,272	29,743 \$4 26484 \$126,849			
Aug 00	27,218	\$3 39000	\$92,269	28,830 \$4 04357 \$116,576			
Sep 00	0		\$0	6,527 \$4 75716 \$31,050			
Oct 99	14,871	\$2 75200	\$40,925	16,244 \$1 71380 \$27,839			
Nov 99	0		\$0	33,470 \$2,99352 \$100,193			
Dec 99	0		\$0	17,228 \$2 23444 \$38,495			
	62,836	\$3 58817	\$225,466	446,141 \$3 29953 \$1,472,056			
Withdrawal Cha	rge	\$0 01470		\$0 00630			
Rate per MMBtu	ı	\$3 60287		\$3 30583			
Rate per MCF		\$3.73257		\$3.33226			

CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY
DETAIL OF RATES AND SURCHARGES USED TO COMPUTE PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT
EFFECTIVE.
December 1, 2000

TENNESSEE		Tanff Rate	Effective Rate	SOUTHERN			Tanff Rate	Effective Rate
FT-A Demand	Zone 1 - 1	5 61	\$5.61000	FT Demand	Zone 3		10 79	\$10.79000
Total FT-A Dema	and		\$5.61000	GRI			10 75	0 12300
				Southern Energy				0.37170
				Total FT Demand				\$11.28470
FT-A Commodity	Zone 0 - 289	6 0 0669	\$0 01873					V 1 1.2077 U
	Zone 1 - 729	6 0 0572	<b>\$0.04118</b>	FT Commodity	Prod - 3		0 0290	\$0 02900
Total FT-A Commodi	ty		0 05991	GSR				\$0.0004
ACA			0.00220	Storage Receiving Surcharge				\$0 0040
GRI			N/A	ACA				0 00220
TCSM			0.00000	GRI				0 00720
TCRA			N/A	Total FT Commodity				\$0.04280
Total FT-A Com	nodity		\$0.06211					,
				IT Commodity	Prod - 3		0 3840	\$0.38400
IT Commodity	Zone 1 - 1	0 2672	\$0 26720	GSR				\$0 0004
ACA			0 00220	Storage Receiving Surcharge				\$0 0040
GRI			N/A	ACA				0 00220
TCSM			0 00000	GRI				0 00720
TCRA	<del></del>		N/A	Total IT Commodity				\$0.39780
Total IT Commo	dity		\$0.26940					
AST TENNESSEE				Southern CSS Storage Service				
AST TENNESSEE				Injection Charge				0 00630
FT-A Demand				Withdrawal Charge				0.00630
TCRA (Article 25)		7 21	\$7 21000					
GRI (Article 33) (High	Lond Control		-0 05000	Tennessee FS Storage Service				
Total FT-A Dema			0.23000	FS-PA	67%	71%		
Total T-A Dellia	Hu		\$7.39000	Injection Rate			0 0053	
FT-A Commodity		0 0011	60.00440	Withdrawal Rate			0 0053	
TCRA (Article 25)		00011	\$0 00110	<b>50</b>				
GRI (Article 33)			0 00000	FS-MA	28%	29%		
ACA (Article 34)			0 00750	Injection Rate			0 0102	
Total FT-A Comm	odity		0 00220 \$0.01080	Withdrawal Rate		1	0 0102	
	Journ		\$0.0 1080	50 DA 844 1				
IT Commodity		0 2381	\$0 23810	FS-PA/MA Injection Average		100%		0 00672
GRI (Article 33)		0 2001	0.00750	FS-PA/MA Withdrawal Average	ge			0 00672
ACA (Article 34)			0.00730	CNC CSS Stamps Comme	==-			
Total IT Commodi	ty		\$0.24780	CNG GSS Storage Service Injection Rate	5%			
	-		77.27100	Withdrawal Rate			0 0162	
				AAIIIIIIIAMAI KAIG		(	0 0147	
				Tennessee Storage Injection Ave	100%			0 00722

## CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY COMPUTATION OF PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT AND ALLOCATION TO RATE CLASSES BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDE September 30, 2000

RATES TO BE EFFECTIVE

December 1, 2000

Rate Schedule	Monthly Contract Demand	Annual Commodity MCF Sales	CUR Demand	RENT GAS CC		(D) *Demand (D)	(P)
1-1					Total		Commodity Total
	7,700	1,208,420	669,348	7,209,698	7,879,046	7 2445	5 9662 5 9662
L-1		2,784,926		18,434,855	18,434,855		6 6195 6 6195
T-2**	0		0		0	7 2445	20,00
ALL OTHER	134,334	7,006,518	11,678,148	41,802,420	53,480,568	1 6668	5 9662 7 6330
V-1						0 2382	5 9662 6 2044
Total Cost Adjustment	142,033	10,999,864	\$12,347,496	\$67,446,974	\$79,794,470		

## 100% LOAD FACTOR DEMAND COST/MCF

<sup>\*</sup> Total Demand Cost = Total Firm Cost / 142033 X 365 Da \$0 2382

\* Unit Cost base 92,394 annual contract demand units

<sup>\*\*</sup> All Demand Units for I-1/T-2 Customers are billed under the I-1 rate

#### TRA NO. 1

## CURRENT LEVEL OF PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT (IN DOLLARS PER MCF)

#### RATE TARIFF

Effective Date	I-1 Demand	I-1 Commodity	* L-1 Commodity	T-2 Demand	V-1 Commodity	ll Other Commodity
BASE RATES	\$15 0861	\$2 2751	\$2 2751	\$15 0861	\$2 7710	\$3 5120
11-01-99	\$0 1000	\$0 3000	\$0 3000	\$0 1000	\$0 1000	\$0 3000
12-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
1-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
2-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
3-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
4-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
5-01-99	(\$0 1514)	(\$0 6033)	(\$0 6033)	(\$0 1514)	(\$0 4050)	(\$0 3800)
6-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
7-01-99	\$0 0016	\$0 2599	\$0 2599	\$0 0016	\$0 2600	\$0 2440
8-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
9-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 5374	\$0 5374	\$0 0000	\$0 5370	\$0 6570
10-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 2563	\$0 8115	\$0 0000	\$0 2540	\$0 2543
11-01-99	(\$7 7316)	(\$0 1037)	(\$0 0633)	(\$7 7316)	(\$0 3551)	\$0 0287
12-01-99	\$0 0000	\$0 2281	\$0 3886	\$0 0000	\$0 2281	\$0 2279
1-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
2-01-00	\$0 0000	(\$0 5599)	(\$0 9017)	\$0 0000	(\$0 5599)	(\$0 5599)
3-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0,0000
4-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 3488	\$0 2618	\$0 0000	\$0 3488	\$0 3957
5-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
6-01-00	(\$0 0602)	\$0 1691	\$0 4842	(\$0 0602)	\$0 1671	\$0 0908
7-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 9174	\$1 4861	\$0 0000	\$0 9174	\$0 9419
8-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
9-01-00	\$0 0000	(\$0 3497)	(\$0 6810)	\$0 0000	(\$0 3497)	(\$0 3783)
10-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
11-01-00	\$0 0000	\$1 3896	\$1 6936	\$0 0000	\$1 3896	\$1 3896
12-01-00	\$0 0000	\$0 9011	\$0 3706	\$0 0000	\$0 9011	\$0 9093
0						
Current Cost	\$7 2445	\$5 9662	\$6 6195	\$7 2445	\$6 2044	\$7 6330

#### \*NOTE

The L-1 commodity rate shall also be applicable to the air conditioning rate for rate schedules R-1, R-4 AND C-1

#### **CURRENT LEVEL OF SURCHARGES AND REFUND CREDITS**

## AMOUNTS INDICATED BELOW APPLY TO THE BILLING DETERMINANTS OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TARIFF

RATES Billing Unit	I-1 Demand MCF	I-1 Commodity MCF	L-1 Commodity MCF	T-1 Commodity MCF	T-2 Demand MCF	T-2 Commodity MCF	All Other CCF	A/C CCF	V-1 CCF
Supplier Refund 99-00*	\$0 0000	(\$0 0292)	(\$0 0292)	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	(\$0 0029)	(\$0 0029)	\$0.0000
ACA Refund 99-00**	(\$0 5856)	\$0 2352	\$0 2352	\$0 0000	(\$0 5856)	\$0 0000	\$0 0174	\$0 0174	\$0 0000
IMCR Refund 99-00****	(\$1 1245)	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	(\$1 1245)	\$0 0000	(\$0 0118)	(\$0 0118)	\$0.0000
GSR/Transition Costs ****	\$0 0000	\$0 0048	\$0 0048	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0005	\$0 0005	\$0 0005
ACA Refund 98-99***	\$0 7964	(\$0 0348)	(\$0 0348)	\$0 0000	\$0 7964	\$0 0000	\$0 0150	\$0 0150	\$0 0000
TOTAL	(\$0 9137)	\$0 1760	\$0 1760	\$0 0000	(\$0 9137)	\$0 0000 ======	\$0 0181	\$0 0181	\$0 0005

<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup>IMCR refund made effective December 1, 2000 for a period of 12 months or shorter as may be required to appropriately refund off system sales revenues to customers Outstanding balance will be applied to next IMCR refund

<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup>GSR surcharge made effective for Nov 1, 2000 and to remain into effect for a period of 12 months or shorter period as may be required to appropriately collect the amount from Company's customers The Company anticipates that this will be the last GSR filing since all remaining pipeline transition costs have phased out this year

<sup>\*</sup>Supplier refund made effective December 1, 2000 for a period of 12 months or shorter as may be required to appropriately refunds amount due to customer. Outstanding balance will be applied to next supplier refund.

<sup>\*\*</sup>ACA 99-00 surcharge made effective December 1, 2000, for a period of 12 months or shorter as may be required to collect PGA under-recovery Outstanding balance will be applied to next ACA filing

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> ACA 98-99 refund made effective December 1, 1999 for a period of 12 months or for a longer or shorter period of time as may be required to appropriately collect the amount from Company's customers's See attached breakdown of collection items

#### MCF SALES BY RATE CLASS AND OFF-SYSTEM REVENUE CREDIT ESTIMATE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED September 30, 2000

	 J	Coptember	30, <u>2</u> 000
Month	 		

Month	<u>l-1</u>	L-1	All Other	TOTAL	T-1 & T-2	TOTAL
Jan 00	69,554	178,513	1,223,383	1,471,450	579,794	2,051,244
Feb 00	116,038	159,104	1,428,031	1,703,173	628,202	2,331,375
Mar 00	125,792	193,766	865,901	1,185,459	645,546	1,831,005
Apr 00	136,151	285,786	603,573	1,025,510	484,905	1,510,415
May 00	110,066	659,259	405,086	1,174,411	96,290	1,270,701
June 00	115,651	605,173	269,839	990,663	89,448	1,080,111
Jul 00	97,023	11,729	185,220	293,972	611,891	905,863
Aug 00	105,067	24,527	187,422	317,016	724,223	1,041,239
Sep 00	103,675	506,873	231,694	842,242	109,119	951,361
Oct 99	76,776	45,400	270,253	392,429	739,012	1,131,441
Nov 99	90,363	74,020	495,319	659,702	593,997	1,253,699
Dec 99	62,264	40,776	840,797	943,837	707,554	1,651,391
TOTAL	1,208,420	2,784,926	7,006,518	10,999,864	6,009,981	17,009,845

Off-System	٦
------------	---

				Oii-System		
Month	R - 1	R - 4	C - 1	Revenue Credit	T-1*	T-2
Jan 00	654,569	7,525	561,289	\$0 00	515,617	64,177
Feb 00	766,607	3,730	657,694	\$0 00	613,629	14,573
Mar 00	415,024	2,291	448,586	\$0 00	624,104	21,442
Apr 00	297,814	4,910	300,849	\$0 00	471,639	13,266
May 00	176,800	1,025	227,261	\$0 00	92,770	3,520
June 00	89,967	927	178,945	\$0 00	81,431	8,017
Jul 00	68,860	881	115,479	\$0.00	597,599	14,292
Aug 00	58,023	908	128,491	\$0.00	711,345	12,878
Sep 00	77,294	782	153,618	\$0.00	107,041	2,078
Oct 99	105,350	1,430	163,473	\$0.00	663,739	•
Nov 99	256,421	1,623	237,275	\$616,464 84	=	75,273
Dec 99	452,062	1,623	387,112		551,597	42,400
TOTAL				\$499,884.00	625,148	82,406
TOTAL	3,418,791	27,655	3,560,072	\$1,116,348 84	5,655,659	354,322

MCF VOLUMES PURCHASED (BY PIPELINE) AND COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE BTU ADJUSTMENT FOR GAS TRANSPORTED ON EAST TENNESSEE AND SOUTHERN

TWELVE MONTHS ENDED September 30, 2000

#### **EAST TENNESSEE**

	FT	IT	FS	FS	CNG	CNG		BTU	MMBTU
Month	Purchases	Purchases	Inj	W/D	lnj	W/D	TOTAL	ADJ	VOLUMES
Jan 00	700,107	0	(45,255)	346,091	0	28,809	1,029,752	1.036	1,066,823
Feb 00	699,159	0	(19,528)	195,438	0	7,030	882,099	1 036	913,854
Mar 00	613,607	0	(127,851)	3,865	0	61,592	551,213	1 036	571,056
Apr 00	627,636	0	(94,161)	30,689	0	0	564,164	1 036	584,474
May 00	674,104	0	(187,731)	62,039	0	0	548,412	1 036	568,155
June 00	645,981	0	(316,517)	20,427	0	0	349,891	1 036	362,487
Jul 00	146,592	0	(337,758)	0	(20,026)	0	(211,192)	1 036	(218,794)
Aug 00	134,991	0	(261,549)	21,656	(26,272)	0	(131,174)	1 036	(135,896)
Sep 00	466,921	0	(252,779)	37,354	(13,956)	0	237,540	1 036	246,091
Oct 99	349,208	0	(67,014)	97,738	(14,354)	0	365,578	1 036	378,738
Nov 99	354,990	0	(32,522)	167,971	0	0	490,439	1 036	508.095
Dec 99	513,727	0	(19,432)	388,776	0	36,491	919,562	1 036	952,666
TOTAL	5,927,023	0	(1,762,097)	1,372,044	(74,608)	133.922	5.596.284	1 036	5 797 749

#### SOUTHERN

	FT	1/ IT	css	css		BTU	MMBTU
Month	Purchases	Purchases	Inj	W/D	TOTAL	ADJ	VOLUMES
Jan 00	617,836	5,498	(10,244)	124,261	737,351	1 008	743,249
Feb 00	482,192	10,252	(24,711)	117,835	585,568	1 008	590,252
Mar 00	498,560	9,988	(39,343)	58,511	527,716	1 008	531,937
Apr 00	281,098	36,481	(127,374)	59,997	250,202	1 008	252,203
May 00	330,388	21	34,248	73,260	437,917	1 008	441,399
June 00	365,679	421	(73,069)	3,798	296,829	1 008	299,204
Jul 00	363,467	32,399	(29,507)	27,148	393,507	1 008	396,655
Aug 00	303,747	157	(28,830)	25,393	300,467	1 008	302,870
Sep 00	945,774	108	(6,527)	133,277	1,072,632	1 008	1,081,213
Oct 99	201,590	4,587	(16,115)	20,961	211,023	1 008	212,711
Nov 99	366,942	13,819	(33,204)	92,780	440,337	1 008	443,859
Dec 99	578,583	5,772	(17,091)	86,589	653,853	1 008	659,084
TOTAL	5,335,856	119,503	(371,767)	823,810	5,907,402	1 008	5,954,636

**TOTAL MCF PURCHASES** 

11,503,686

<sup>1/</sup> Includes enduser cashout purchases

REFUNDS & BILLING BASE RATE **PGA** URCHARGE RATE R-1 WINTER (NOV - APR) Base Use Charge/Bill Residential \$7,5000 \$7 5000 General Service First 25 CCF \$0 2900 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$1 0714 Next 25 CCF \$0 2000 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9814 Over 50 CCF \$0 1750 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9564 SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Base Use Charge/Bill \$7 5000 \$7 5000 First 25 CCF \$0 2100 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9914 Next 25 CCF \$0 1500 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9314 Over 50 CCF \$0.0450 \$0.7633 \$0 0181 \$0 8264 Air Conditioning SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Over 50 CCF \$0 0450 \$0 5966 \$0 0181 \$0 6597 Standby Service Rate Per CCF of Input per Mon **Demand Charge** \$0,3000 \$0.7245 (\$0.0914) \$0 9331 R-4 WINTER (NOV - APR) Base Use Charge/Unit Muiti-Family \$6 0000 \$6 0000 Housing Service Commodity Charge/CCF \$0 1800 \$0 7633 \$0.0181 \$0 9614 SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Base Use Charge/Bill \$6 0000 \$6 0000 Commodity Charge/CCF \$0 1600 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9414 Air Conditioning SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Flat Rate / CCF \$0 0450 \$0 5966 \$0 0181 \$0 6597 C-1 WINTER (NOV - APR) Commercial & Industrial Base Use Charge/Bill \$20 0000 \$20 0000 General Service First 3,000 CCF \$0 2750 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$1 0564 Next 2,000 CCF 0.2510 \$0.7633 \$0 0181 \$1 0324 Next 10,000 CCF 0 2445 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$1 0259 Over 15,000 CCF 0 1265 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9079 SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Base Use Charge/Bill \$15,0000 \$15 0000 First 3,000 CCF \$0 2159 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9973 Next 2,000 CCF 0 1714 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9528 Next 10,000 CCF 0 1598 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9412 Over 15,000 CCF 0 1265 \$0 7633 \$0 0181 \$0 9079 Air Conditioning SUMMER (MAY - OCT) Flat Rate / CCF \$0 0450 \$0 5966 \$0 0181 \$0 6597 Standby Service Demand Charge Rate Per CCF of Input per Mon \$0 3000 \$0 7245 (\$0.0914) \$0 9331 Base Use Charge \$300 0000 \$300 0000 Large Volume Demand Charge / Demand Unit \$3 0000 \$7 2445 (\$0 9137) \$9 3308 Firm Service Commodity Charge / MCF First 1,500 MCF \$0 8888 \$5 9662 \$0 1760 \$7 0310 Next 2,500 MCF \$0 7598 \$5 9662 \$0 1760 \$6 9020 Next 11,000 MCF \$0 4312 \$5 9662 \$0 1760 \$6 5734 Over 15,000 MCF \$0 2650 \$5 9662 \$0 1760 \$6 4072 L-1 Base Use Charge \$300 0000 \$300 0000 Interruptible Service Commodity Charge/MCF First 1,500 MCF \$0 8888 \$6 6195 \$0 1760 \$7 6843 Next 2,500 MCF \$0 7598 \$6 6195 \$0 1760 \$7 5553 Next 11,000 MCF \$0 4312 \$6 6195 \$0 1760 \$7 2267 Over 15,000 MCF \$0 2650 \$6 6195 \$0 1760 \$7 0605 T-1 Customer Charge \$300 0000 \$300 0000 Interruptible Transportation Transportation Charge/MCF Service First 1,500 MCF \$0 8888 \$0 0000 \$0 8888 Next 2,500 MCF \$0 7598 \$0 0000 \$0 7598 Next 11,000 MCF \$0 4312 \$0,0000 \$0.4312 Over 15,000 MCF \$0 2650 \$0 0000 \$0 2650 Customer Charge \$300 0000 \$300 0000 Interruptible Transportation Demand Charge/Demand Unit \$3 0000 \$7 2445 (\$0 9137) \$9 3308 Service with Firm Backup Transportation Charge/MCF First 1,500 MCF \$0 8888 \$0,000 \$0 RRRR Next 2,500 MCF \$0 7598 \$0,0000 \$0 7598 Next 11,000 MCF \$0 4312 \$0,0000 \$0 4312 Over 15,000 MCF \$0 2650 \$0 0000 \$0 2650 Natural Gas Vehicle Base Use Charge / Bill \$17 5000 \$17 5000 Service Flat Rate / CCF \$0 0450 \$0 6204 \$0 0005 \$0 6659

## CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY REFUND EFFECTIVE. December 1, 2000

## ALLOCATION OF ACA REFUND TO RATE CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDED SEPT 30, 2000

RATE SCHEDULE	Contract Demand	Annual Commodity MCF Sales	Demand	Commodity	TOTAL	Demand Per Unit	Demand	Commodity	TOTAL
I-1	7,699	1,208,420	(54,098)	\$284,244	\$230,146	(\$0 5856)		\$0 2352	\$0 2352
L-1		2,784,926	0	\$655,070	\$655,070			\$0 2352	\$0 2352
T-2			0	\$0	\$0	(\$0 5856)			
ALL OTHER	61,301	7,006,518	(430,737)	\$1,648,073	\$1,217,336		(\$0 0615)	) \$0 2352	\$0 1737
V-1			0	\$0	\$0		\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
TOTAL	69,000	10,999,864	(484,835)	\$2,587,387	\$2,102,55,2				
DESCRIPTION OF REFUN	DITEM		Demand	Commodity	TOTAL				
ACA 99-00			(\$484,835)	\$2,587,387	\$2,102,552				
TOTAL			(\$484,835)	\$2,587,387	\$2,102,552				

	ť	SCHEDULE	OF PURCHA	ASED GAS REI	FUND BALANCES			
	I-1 & T-2	1-1	L-1	T-1 &T-2	ALL OTHER			
•	Demand	Commodity	Commodity	Commodity	Demand Commodity	-		
Adjustment per MCF	(\$0 5856)	\$0 2352	\$0 2352	\$0 0000	(\$0 0615) \$0 2352	_		
MCF SALES								
JULY 1999	0	0	0	0	0			
AUGUST	0	0	0	0	0			
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0	0			
OCTOBER	0	0	0	0	0			
NOVEMBER	0	0	0	0	0			
DECEMBER	0	0	0	0	0			
JANUARY 2000	0	0		0	0			
FEBRUARY	0	0	0	0	0			
MARCH	0	0	0	o	0			
APRIL	0	0	0	0	0			
MAY	0	0	0	0	0			
JUNE	0	0	0	0	0			
				_	-			
						Commodity	Demand	Total
						DR ACCT	DR ACCT	CR ACCT
REFUND CREDITS MADE						251-100	251-100	407-302
Beginning Balance 7/1/99	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	2,587,387	(484,835)	2,102,552
JULY 1999	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	2,587,387	(484,835)	2,102,552
AUGUST	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	2,587,387	(484,835)	2,102,552
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	2,587,387	(484,835)	2,102,552
OCTOBER	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	2,587,387	(484,835)	2,102,552
NOVEMBER	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	2,587,387	(484.835)	2,102,552
DECEMBER	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	2,587,387	(484,835)	2,102,552
JANUARY 2000	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	2.587.387	(484.835)	2,102,552
FEBRUARY	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073	_	(484,835)	2,102,552
MARCH	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	0	(430,737) 1,648,073		(484,835)	2,102,552
APRIL	0	0	. 0	0	0 0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	Ō	(430,737) 1,648,073	_	(484,835)	2,102,552
MAY	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	(404,055)	2,102,552
BALANCE	(54,098)	284,244	655,070	Ö	(430,737) 1,648,073	_	(484.835)	2,102,552
JUNE	0	Ó	0	0	0 0	0	(404,000)	2,102,332
881 8116-			-	•	- 0	U	U	Ų

(430,737) 1,648,073 2,587,387 (484,835) 2,102,652

BALANCE

(54,098)

284,244 655,070

#### ACTUAL COST ADJUSTMENT (ACA) 1999-2000 DETAIL OF ITEMS

	Commodity	<u>Demand</u>	<u>Total</u>
ACA 97-98 Balance @ 6/30/00	275,433.78	20,673.08	296,106.86
ACA 99-00 Balance @6/30/00	2,311,952.74	(505,507.80)	1,806,444.94
Total Balance	2,587,386.52	(484,834.72)	2,102,551.80 (Under-recovery)

#### **CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY** REFUND EFFECTIVE: December 1, 2000

#### ALLOCATION OF SUPPLIER REFUND TO RATE CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDED SEPT 30, 2000

RATE SCHEDULE	Contract Demand	Annual Commodity MCF Sales	Demand	Commodity	TOTAL	Demand Per Unit	Demand	Commodity	TOTAL
I-1	7,699	1,208,420	0	(\$35,266)	(\$35,266)	\$0 0000		(\$0 0292)	(\$0 0292)
L-1		2,784,926	0	(\$81,273)	(\$81,273)			(\$0 0292)	(\$0 0292)
T-2			0	\$0	\$0	\$0 0000		(40 0232)	(\$0.0292)
ALL OTHER	61,301	7,006,518	0	(\$204,472)	(\$204,472)		\$0 0000	(\$0 0292)	(\$0 0292)
V-1			0	\$0	\$0		\$0 0000	. ,	\$0 0000
TOTAL	69,000	10,999,864	0	(\$321,011)	(\$321,011)			11 3000	40 0000

DESCRIPTION OF REFUND ITEM	Demand	Commodity	TOTAL
99-00 Supplier Refund	\$0	(\$321,011)	(\$321,011)
TOTAL	\$0	(\$321,011)	(\$321,011)

#### SCHEDULE OF PURCHASED GAS REFUND BALANCES

_	I-1 & T-2	1-1	L-1	T-1 &T-2	ALL (	OTHER			
	Demand	Commodity	Commodity	Commodity	Demand	Commodity	• •		
Adjustment per MCF	\$0 0000	(\$0 0292)	(\$0 0292)	\$0 0000	\$0 0000		-		
MCF SALES									
JULY 1999	0	•		_					
AUGUST	0	0	0	0		0			
SEPTEMBER	-	0	0	0		0			
OCTOBER	0	0	0	0		0			
NOVEMBER	0	0	0	0		0			
DECEMBER	0	0	0	0		0			
· —· ·	0	0	0	0		0			
JANUARY 2000	0	0	0	0		0			
FEBRUARY	0	0	0	0		0			
MARCH	0	0	0	0		0			
APRIL	0	0	0	0		0			
MAY	0	0	0	0		0			
JUNE	0	0	0	0		ō			
						•			
							Commodity	Demand	Total
REFUND CREDITS MADE							DR ACCT	DR ACCT	CR ACCT
							251-100	251-100	407-302
Beginning Balance 7/1/99	0	(35,266)	(B1,273)	0	0	(204,472)	(321,011)	0	(321,011)
JULY 1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	0	(204,472)	(321,011)	0	(321,011)
AUGUST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	021,011,
BALANCE	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	0		(321,011)	0	(321,011)
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o	_
BALANCE	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	ō		(321,011)	0	0
OCTOBER	0	0	0	0	ō	0	021,011)	-	(321,011)
BALANCE	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	o	0	_	(321,011)	0	0
NOVEMBER	0	0	0	0	0			0	(321,011)
BALANCE	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	0	0	0	0	0
DECEMBER	0	0	0	0	_	(204,472)		0	(321,011)
BALANCE	0	(35,266)	(81,273)		0	0	0	0	0
JANUARY 2000	ō	(00,200)	(01,2/3)	0	0	(204,472)		0	(321,011)
BALANCE	ò	(35,266)	_	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEBRUARY	o		(81,273)	0	0	(204,472)	(321,011)	0	(321,011)
BALANCE	0	(35.000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARCH	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	0	(204,472)	(321,011)	0	(321,011)
BALANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APRIL	_	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	0	(204,472)	(321,011)	0	(321,011)
BALANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MAY	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	0	(204,472)	(321,011)	0	(321,011)
BALANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JUNE	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	0	(204,472)	(321,011)	Ō	(321,011)
BALANCE	0	0	0	0	0	o	0	0	0
MININE	0	(35,266)	(81,273)	0	0	(204,472)	(321,011)	Ŏ	(321,011)

## CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY REFUND EFFECTIVE: December 1, 2000

## ALLOCATION OF IMCR REFUND TO RATE CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON VOLUMES FOR TWELVE MONTHS ENDED SEPT 30, 2000

	Contract Demand	Commodity MCF Sales	Demand	Commodity	TOTAL	Demand Per Unit	Demand	Commodity	TOTAL
I-1	7,699	1,208,420	(103,892)	\$0	(\$103,892)	(\$1 1245)		\$0 0000	\$0 0000
L-1	.,	2,784,926	0	\$0	\$0	•		\$0 0000	\$0 0000
T-2			0	\$0	\$0	(\$1 1245)			
ALL OTHER	61,301	7,006,518	(827,207)	\$0	(\$827,207)	•	(\$0 1181)	\$0,000	(\$0 1181)
V-1		• • • • •	` ' o	\$0	\$0		\$0 0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000
TOTAL	69,000	10,999,864	(931,099)	\$0	(\$931,099)				
DESCRIPTION OF REFUND	ITEM		Demand	Commodity	TOTAL				
99-00 IMCR refund (Off Sys 5	Sales)	•	(\$931,099)	\$0	(\$931,099)				
TOTAL	-		(\$931,099)	\$0	(\$931,099)				

#### SCHEDULE OF PURCHASED GAS REFUND BALANCES

	I-1 & T-2	I-1	L-1	T-1 &T-2	ALL C	THER			
_	Demand	Commodity (	Commodity	Commodity	Demand	Commodity			
Adjustment per MCF	(\$1 1245)	\$0,0000	\$0 0000	\$0 0000	(\$0 1181)	\$0 0000			
MCF SALES									
JULY 1999	0	0	0	0		0			
AUGUST	0	0	0	0		0			
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0		0			
OCTOBER	0	0	0	0		0			
NOVEMBER	0	0	0	0		0			
DECEMBER	0	0	0	0		0			
JANUARY 2000	0	0	0	0		0			
FEBRUARY	0	0	0	0		0			
MARCH	0	0	0	0		0			
APRIL	0	0	0	0		0			
MAY	0	0	0	0		0			
JUNE	0	0	0	0		0			
							Commodity	Demand	Total
							DR ACCT	DR ACCT	CR ACCT
REFUND CREDITS MADE							251-100	251-100	407-302
Beginning Balance 7/1/99	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207)	0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
JULY 1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207)	0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
AUGUST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207)	0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207)	0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
OCTOBER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207)	0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
NOVEMBER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207)	0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
DECEMBER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207)	) 0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
JANUARY 2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207	) 0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
FEBRUARY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207	) 0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
MARCH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207	) 0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
APRIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207	) 0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
MAY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207	) 0	0	(931,099)	(931,099)
JUNE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	(103,892)	0	0	0	(827,207	) 0	• •	(931,099)	(931,099)

CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY PURCHASED GAS REFUNDS DUE CUSTOMERS CALCULATION OF INTEREST FY 1999

BEGINNING BALANCE 251-100	SUPPLIER REFUNDS/ADJ.	AMOUNTS RETURNED	E.B BEFORE	AVERAGE BALANCE	INTEREST RATE	CURRENT MO. INT. TO RECORD	AMOUNT RECORDED	ADJUSTMENT TO RECORD IN NEXT MONTH	E B. INCLUDING INTEREST
243,114	o	(53,744)	189,370	216,242	0 7083%	1,723	1,723	0	191,093
191,093	0	0	191,093	191,093	0 7083%	1,354	1,354	0	192,447
192,447	2,547	0	194,994	193,721	0 7083%	1,372	1,372	0	196,366
196,366	0	0	196,366	196,366	0 6808%	1,337	1,337	0	197,703
197,703	0	0	197,703	197,703	0 6808%	1,346	1,346	0	199,049
199,049	0	0	199,049	199,049	0 6808%	1,355	1,355	0	200,404
200,404	2,625	0	203,029	201,717	0 6458%	1,303	1,303	0	204,332
204,332	0	0	204,332	204,332	0 6458%	1,320	1,320	0	205,652
205,652	0	0	205,652	205,652	0 6458%	1,328	1,328	0	206,980
206,980	0	(4,344)	202,636	204,808	0 6458%	1,323	1,323	0	203,959
203,959	172,153	(5,140)	370,972	287,466	0 6458%	1,857	1,857	0	372,829
372,829	0	(5,481)	367,348	370,089	0 6458%	2,390	2,390	0	369,738
	BEGINNING BALANCE 251-100 243,114 191,093 192,447 196,366 197,703 199,049 200,404 204,332 205,652 206,980 203,959 372,829	!	SUPPLIER REFUNDS/ADJ. 0 0,2,547 0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0	SUPPLIER AMOUNTS REFUNDS/ADJ. RETURNED  0 (53,744) 0 0 2,547 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	SUPPLIER AMOUNTS E.B BEFORE AVERAGE REFUNDS/ADJ. RETURNED INTEREST BALANCE 0 (53,744) 189,370 216,247 0 191,093 191,093 2,547 0 196,366 196,366 0 0 197,703 197,703 0 197,703 197,703 0 199,049 199,049 2,625 0 203,029 201,717 0 205,652 205,652 0 205,652 204,332 0 (4,344) 202,636 204,808 172,153 (5,140) 367,348 370,089	SUPPLIER AMOUNTS E.B BEFORE AVERAGE IN RETURNED INTEREST BALANCE  0 (53,744) 189,370 216,242 0 0 191,093 191,093 2,547 0 194,994 193,721 0 0 0 196,366 196,366 0 0 197,703 197,703 0 0 199,049 199,049 2,625 0 203,029 201,717 0 0 0 204,332 204,332 0 0 0 205,652 205,652 0 (4,344) 202,636 204,808 172,153 (5,140) 370,972 287,466	SUPPLIER         AMOUNTS         E.B BEFORE INTEREST         AVERAGE INTEREST         INTEREST         BALANCE         RATE         1           0         (53,744)         189,370         216,242         0 7083%           0         0         191,093         191,093         0 7083%           2,547         0         194,994         193,721         0 7083%           0         0         196,366         196,366         0 6808%           0         0         197,703         197,703         0 6808%           2,625         0         203,029         201,717         0 6458%           0         0         204,332         204,332         0 6458%           0         0         205,652         205,652         0 6458%           0         0         207,433         204,808         0 6458%           0         0         205,652         205,652         0 6458%           172,153         (5,140)         370,972         287,466         0 6458%           172,153         (5,143)         367,348         370,089         0 6458%	SUPPLIER         AMOUNTS         E.B BEFORE REFUNDS/ADJ.         AMOUNTS         E.B BEFORE REFUNDS/ADJ.         AVERAGE RATE         INTEREST MO.INT.         MO.INT.         AMOUNT MO.INT.         MO.INT.         AMOUNT MO.INT.	SUPPLIER         AMOUNTS         E.B BEFORE REFUNDS/ADJ.         AMOUNTS         E.B BEFORE REFUNDS/ADJ.         AVERAGE RATE         INTEREST MO.INT.         MO.INT.         AMOUNT MO.INT.         MO.INT.         AMOUNT MO.INT.

C:Wy Documents/PGA Filings/PGA Filings 2000/December 2000/[251100-InterestCalc-FY2000 xls]2000

CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY PURCHASED GAS REFUNDS DUE CUSTOMERS CALCULATION OF INTEREST FY 2000

BEGINNING BALANCE 251-100	SUPPLIER REFUNDS/ADJ	AMOUNTS RETURNED	E B BEFORE	AVERAGE BALANCE	INTEREST RATE	CURRENT MO. INT. TO RECORD	AMOUNT RECORDED	Accumulated ADJUSTMENT TO RECORD	E.B INCLUDING INTEREST
369,738	6,268	(3,795)	372,211	370,975	0 6617%	2,646	2,646	0	374,857
374,857	0	(6,198)	368,659	371,758	0 6617%	2,460	2,460	0	371,119
371,119	0	(9,641)	361,478	366,299	0 6617%	2,424	<del>\$</del>	2,384	361,518
361,518	0	(14,137)	347,381	354,450	0 6908%	2,449	2,500	2,333	349,881
349,881	0	(16,465)	333,416	341,649	0 6908%	2,360	2,500	2,193	335,916
335,916	0	(10,660)	325,256	330,586	0 6908%	2,284	2,500	1,977	327,756
327,756	1,446	(8,106)	321,096	324,426	0 7150%	2,320	2,500	1,797	323,596
323,596	0	(7,303)	316,293	319,944	0 7150%	2,288	2,500	1,585	318,793
318,793	0	(5,724)	313,069	315,931	0 7150%	2,259	2,500	1,344	315,569
315,569	0	0	315,569	315,569	0 7517%	2,372	3,382	334	318,951
318,951	0	0	318,951	318,951	0 7517%	2,397	2,060	671	321,011
321,011	0	0	321,011	321,011	0 7517%	2,413	2,073	1,011	323,084
	BEGINNING BALANCE 251-100 369,738 374,857 371,119 361,518 349,881 335,916 327,756 323,596 318,793 315,569 318,951 321,011	119366618978	SUPPLIER REFUNDS/ADJ  8 6,268 7 0 9 0 0 1 0 0 6 1,446 6 1,446 6 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	SUPPLIER AMOUNTS REFUNDS/ADJ RETURNED  8 6,268 (3,795) 7 0 (6,198) 9 0 (14,137) 1 0 (16,465) 6 0 (10,660) 6 1,446 (8,106) 6 0 (7,303) 6 0 (5,724) 9 0 0 1 0 0	SUPPLIER AMOUNTS E B BEFORE REFUNDS/ADJ RETURNED INTEREST  8 6,268 (3,795) 372,211  8 6,268 (3,795) 372,211  7 0 (6,198) 368,659  9 0 (9,641) 361,478  0 (14,137) 347,381  1 0 (16,465) 333,416  0 (10,660) 325,256  6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096  6 0 (7,303) 316,293  3 0 (5,724) 313,069  9 0 0 318,951  1 0 0 0 321,011	SUPPLIER AMOUNTS E B BEFORE AVERAGE II REFUNDS/ADJ RETURNED INTEREST BALANCE  8 6,268 (3,795) 372,211 370,975 7 0 (6,198) 368,659 371,758 9 0 (9,641) 361,478 366,299 8 0 (14,137) 347,381 354,450 1 0 (16,465) 333,416 341,649 6 0 (10,660) 325,256 330,586 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 6 0 (7,303) 316,293 319,944 3 0 (5,724) 313,069 315,931 9 0 0 0 318,951 318,951 1 0 0 0 321,011 321,011	CURRE SUPPLIER AMOUNTS E B BEFORE AVERAGE INTEREST MO. IN REFUNDS/ADJ RETURNED INTEREST BALANCE RATE TO REC  8 6,268 (3,795) 372,211 370,975 0 6617% 0 (6,198) 368,659 371,758 0 6617% 9 0 (9,641) 361,478 366,299 0 6617% 8 0 (14,137) 347,381 354,450 0 6908% 1 0 (16,465) 333,416 341,649 0 6908% 1 0 (10,660) 325,256 330,586 0 6908% 6 1,446 (8,106) 325,256 330,586 0 6908% 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0 7150% 6 0 (7,303) 316,293 319,944 0 7150% 9 0 0 (5,724) 313,069 315,569 0 7517% 1 0 0 318,951 318,951 0 7517% 1 0 0 321,011 321,011 0 7517%	CURRENT REFUNDS/ADJ RETURNED INTEREST BALANCE RATE TO RECORD  8 6,268 (3,795) 372,211 370,975 0.6617% 2,646 7 0 (6,198) 368,659 371,758 0.6617% 2,460 9 0 (9,641) 361,478 366,299 0.6617% 2,424 8 0 (14,137) 347,381 354,450 0.6908% 2,424 9 0 (16,465) 333,416 341,649 0.6908% 2,449 1 0 (10,660) 325,256 330,586 0.6908% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0.7150% 2,284 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	SUPPLIER AMOUNTS E B BEFORE AVERAGE INTEREST MO.INT. AMOUNT REFUNDS/ADJ RETURNED INTEREST BALANCE RATE TO RECORD RECORDED  8 6,268 (3,795) 372,211 370,975 0 6617% 2,646 2,646 7 0 (6,198) 388,659 371,758 0 6617% 2,460 2,460 9 0 (14,137) 347,381 354,450 0 6617% 2,449 2,500 1 (16,465) 333,416 341,649 0 6808% 2,449 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 325,256 330,586 0 6808% 2,284 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0 7150% 2,284 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0 7150% 2,288 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 324,426 0 7150% 2,288 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,289 2,500 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,096 315,931 0 7150% 2,397 2,060 2,060 6 1,446 (8,106) 321,091 0 7517% 2,397 2,060 2,073

C \My Documents\PGA Filings\PGA Filings 2000\December 2000\[251100-InterestCalc-FY2000 xls]2000

## Chattanooga Gas Company Fifty Percent of Gross Profit Resulting From Off-System Sales

		Off-Sy	stem		
Year	Month	Revenue	Cost	Profit	50%
4000	1 1				
1998	July	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	August	53,405.33	46,074.61	7,330.72	3,665.36
	September	43,167.84	36,826.94	6,340.90	3,170.45
	October	92,628.22	82,091.19	10,537.03	5,268.52
	November	677,329.50	771,901.13	(94,571.63)	(47,285.82)
	December	535,278.67	542,364.72	(7,086 05)	(3,543.02)
1999	January	547,690.00	393,670.86	154,019.14	77,009.57
	February	387,502.21	324,839.81	62,662 40	31,331.20
	March	405,247.50	338,009.85	67,237 65	33,618.83
	April	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	May	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	June	0.00	0 00	0.00	0.00
	July	189,450.78	183,666.64	5,784.14	2,892.07
	August	40,485.90	39,578.00	907.90	453.95
	September	266.00	0.00	266.00	133.00
	October	581,341.49	573,893.59	7,447.90	3,723.95
	November	96,522.66	97,479.38	(956.72)	(478.36)
	December	665,818.16	637,977.42	27,840.74	13,920.37
3000	January	912,105.11	711,683.35	200,421.76	100,210.88
	February	674,333.64	563,734 27	110,599.37	55,299.69
	March	658,377.86	645,412.80	12,965 06	6,482.53
	April	150,046.84	145,607.69	4,439 15	2,219.58
	May	279,374.95	266,598.94	12,776 01	6,388.01
	June	546,933.11	504,954.69	41,978.42	20,989.21
	July	2,038,591.26	1,022,467.54	1,016,123.72	508,061.86
	August	1,000,218.88	770,591.43	229,627.45	114,813.73
	September	169,998.85	147,468 98	22,529 87	11,264.94
		10,746,114.76	8,846,893.83	1,899,220.93	949,610.47

1

	DEMAND		сомморпу		LEMAND	СОММОВПУ		TOTAL	
	L1 & T-2	Σ	2	T-18T-2	ALL OTHER	or.	СОММОДПУ	DEMAND	TOTAL
REFUND CREDITIMOF	\$0 0000	(\$0 10350)	(\$0 10350)	0000 O\$	0000 OS	(\$0 10350)		-	
JULY 1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	C	C	c
AUGUST	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NOVEMBER	0 6	34 787	54,283	738,278	263,229	263,229	1,100,538	263,229	1,383,767
DECEMBER	9 0	) (c	04,930 000 a2	405,414 808 438	501,505	505,106	1,346,482	501,505	1,847,987
JANIJARY 1999	o c	44,764	20,839	830,430	1 484 425	754 766	1,8/3,405	754,788	2,428,171
FEBRUARY	•	35,688	44 135	833,470	074,404,1 074,404	C24,404,1	081,785,2	1,404,420	3,861,615
MARCH	• •	37 151	37.450	978.812	1 128 588	1 128 588	071,000,1	440,044	2,705,670
APRIL	• •	46.183	27.108	805 475	700,300	700 158	4,578,000	700 158	3,300,545
MAY	• •	140 135	611 397	95,867	200,130	200,130	780 871	200,588	4.478,030
SUNE	0	134.570	566,020	91.821	228,283	228,300	105,050	228,300	4 246,373
JULY	0	94,510	285,228	381,426	213,638	213,638	874.802	213,638	1 188 440
AUGUST	0	150,118	630,970	94,022	189,895	189,895	1,085,005	189,895	1,254,900
SEPTEMBER	0	145,688	590,918	87,084	222,505	222,505	1,048,173	222,505	1,268,678
OCTOBER	0	76,776	45,400	739,012	270,253	270,253	1,131,441	270,253	1,401,694
REFUND CREDITS MADE							() = Credit to account	ccount	
DECINING DATA AND TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE		967.70	174 074	ď	•	, 00	251-110	ļ	407.305
LILY	o c	94,150 C	, , ,	<b>)</b> C	<b>o</b> c	822,284	(1,2,880,1)	0 0	1,088,271
BALANCE	0	94.136	171.871	0	0	822 284	(1.088.271)	oc	1 088 271
AUGUST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	0	94,138	171,871	0	0	822,264	(1,088,271)	0	1,088,271
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BALANCE	0 0	94,138	171,871	0	0	822,284	(1,088,271)	0	1,088,271
BALANCE BALANCE	- 0	(4,838) 08 074	(5,618)	<b>o</b> c	0 0	(27,244)	37,700	0 (	(37,700)
NOVEMBER	<b>.</b>	598) (3,598)	(5,403)	o c	<b>.</b>	649,500 (51,008)	(1,050,5/1)	<b>&gt;</b> C	L/c/0c0, L
BALANCE		102 572	183 181	c	•	001,830	080,150	o c	080,180)
DECEMBER	0	(5,300)	(8,108)	0	0	(78,118)	89,524	0	(89.524)
BALANCE	0	107,872	189,287	0	0	979,532	(899,851)	0	899,851
JANUARY 1998	0 (	(4,560)	(5,095)	0	0	(151,568)	161,223	0	(161,223)
BALANCE	9 0	112,432	194,382	0 0	0 (	1,131,100	(738,628)	0	738,628
BALANCE	9 0	116 126	(4,437) 198 639	<b>&gt;</b> C	<b>-</b>	(92,896) 1 223 896	(837,781)	0 0	(100,847)
MARCH	0	(3,845)	(3,876)	0	• •	(116,600)	124.321	• •	(124.321)
BALANCE	0	119,971	202,515	0	0	1,340,596	(513,460)	0	513,480
APRIL	0	(4,778)	(2,805)	0	0	(72,486)	80,049	0	(80,049)
BALANCE	0 (	124,749	205,320	0 (	0	1,413,062	(433,411)	0	433,411
MAT DALANCE	<b>&gt;</b> c	130,264)	(63,280)	<b>o</b> c	<b>o</b> c	(31,007)	108,791	0 0	(108,791)
INE STATE	o c	(43,028)	(58.583)	<b>o</b> c	<b>•</b>	800,444, Free ser	(324,020)	<b>-</b>	324,620
BALANCE	o c	153 181	327 183	o c	<b>o</b> c	1.467.696	90,130	<b>o</b> c	(80,130)
ייייי	0	(9.782)	(29.521)	0	9 0	(21.27)	81 415	o c	(61.415)
BALANCE	0	162,963	356,704	0	0	1,489,808	(167,067)	0	167.087
AUGUST	0	(15,537)	(85,305)	0	0	(19,654)	100,496	0	(100,496)
BALANCE	0	178,500	422,009	0	0	1,509,462	(86,571)	0	66,571
SEPTEMBER	0 0	(15,078)	(61.160)	0 0	0 (	(23,029)	99,265	0	(99,265)
	o c	32,070	463, 169	<b>.</b>	<b>&gt;</b> c	1,332,481	32,694	<b>o</b> (	(32,694)
BALANCE	o c	201.522	(4,039) 487,888	o c	<b>o</b> c	1 560 462	40,616	<b>o</b> c	(40,616)
	)	1	)	,	•	421,000	) -	,	(2.5,5)

C Wy Documents/PGA Filings/PGA Filings 2000/December 2000\[offsys\_incr-FY2000 xis]REF SCH 1998

### Chattanooga Gas Company Interruptible Margin Credit Rider Filing For Period From August 1, 1998 Through September 30, 2000

Pifty Percent (50%) of Gross Profit Margin Resulting from Off-System Sales of Gas & LNG	949,610.47
Balance carry forward from 2/1/96 to 7/31/98 IMCR Filing	(73,310.00)
Interest	54,798 14
Total Interruptible Margin Credit Adjustment	931,098.60

#### Attachment N

Off-Sys	stem Sales						Customer Sha	ro.
Year	Month		Revenue	Cost	Profit	50%	Obstomer one	••
1998	July		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
	August		53,405 33	46,074 61	7,330 72	3,665 36		
	September		43,167 84	36.826 94	6,340 90	3,170 45		
	October		92,628 22	82,091 19	10,537 03	5,268 52		
	November		677,329 50	771,901 13	(94,571 63)	(47,285 82)		
	December		535,278 67	542,364 72	(7,086 05)	(3,543 02)		
1999	January		547,690 00	393,670 86	154,019 14	77,009 57		
	February		387,502 21	324,839 81	62,662 40	31,331 20		
	March		405,247 50	338,009 85	67,237 65	33,618 83		
	Apnl				.,	-		
	May		-	-				
	June			-		•		
			\$ 2,742,249 27	\$2 535,779 11	\$ 206,470 16		\$ 103,235	08
	July		189,450 78	183,666 64	5,784 14	2,892 07		
	August		40,485 90	39,578 00	907 90	453 95		
	September		266 00		266 00	133 00		
	October		581 341 49	573,893 59	7,447 90	3,723 95		
	November		96,522 66	97 479 38	(956 72)	(478 36)		
	December		665,818 16	637,977 42	27,840 74	13,920 37		
2000	January		912 105 11	711 683 35	200,421 76	100,210 88		
	February		674,333 64	563,734 27	110 599 37	55 299 69		
	March		658,377 86	645,412 80	12,965 06	6,482 53		
	April		150,046 84	145,607 69	4 439 15	2 219 58		
	May		279,374 95	266,598 94	12,776 01	6,388 01		
	June		546,933 11	504,954 69	41,978 42	20,989 21		
			\$ 4,795,056 50	\$4,370,586 77	\$ 424,469 73		\$ 212,234 8	7
								\$ 315,469 95 Total July 1, 1998-June 2000 24 Months
								\$ 13,144 58 AVG Per Month July 1, 1999-
								June 2000 12 Months
								\$ 157,734 97 Annual Average
	July		\$ 2,038,591 26	\$1,022,467 54	\$1,016,123 72	\$ 508,061 86		
	August		1 000,218 88	770,591 43	229,627 45	114 813 73		
	September		169,998 85	147,468 98	22,529 87	11,264 94		
	Adj 09/00	(1 000)	,,	\$ (4,757 06)	\$ (40 44)	\$ (20 22)		
	October	8,215	44,934 41	44,512 53	421 88	210 94		
	November	301,969	1,441,601 42	1,400,442 57	41,158 85	20,579 42		
	December	86,632	578 000 24	512,165 64	65,834 60	32,917 30		
	January Fobrana	37,635	416,996 27	380,411 35	36,584 92	18 292 46		
	February March	204 425	1,361,490 71	1,173,541 28	187,949 43	93,974 72		
	April	229,321	1,242 677 78	1,031,720 37	210,957 41	105,478 71		
•		75,000 942,197	421,672 50	414 258 30	7,414 20	3 707 10	_	
		342,19/	\$ 8,711,384 82	\$6,892,822 93	\$1,818,561 89		\$ 909,280 9	<u>5</u>

\$2,449,501 78

\$1,224,750 89 Total July 1998-April 2001

\$ 508 061 86 Exclude July 2000

\$ 716,689 03 Total July 1998-April 2001
Excluding July 2000

\$ 21,717 85 AVG Per Month July 1998-April 2001 Excluding July 2000 12 Months Annualized

## Attachment O

# Chattanooga Gas Company ACA for Twelve Months Ended June 30, 2003 Response to Audit Report Comparison of VNG, and AGLC Sharing 2002 and 2003 and Bailment Payment

Schedule 1

Chattanooga Gas Company Bailment Payment 2002	\$ 300,000
Chattanooga Gas Company 2002 Payment Recomputed Based on VNG 2002/2003 Gain to be shared	\$ 373,248 a/
Chattanooga Gas Company 2002 Payment Recomputed Based on AGLC 2002 Settlement and /2003 Gain shared	\$ 268,588 b/

a/ Schedule 2 b/ Schedule 3

# Chattanooga Gas Company ACA for Twelve Months Ended June 30, 2003 Response to Audit Report Recomputation of CGC Bailment Payment Based on VNG Sharing 2002/2003

Schedule 2

373,248

Line		
	1 VNG Total Gain Subject to Sharing 2002	\$ 1,402,487 96 a/
	2 VNG Total Gain Subject to Sharing 2003	\$ 4,744,429 25 b/
	3 VNG 2002 Sharing as % of 2003 Sharing (L1/L2)	29 6%
	4 Chattanooga Sharing 2003	\$ 1.260.974

Schedule 2 A Line 13 Schedule 2 A Line 26

a/

b/

5 (L 3 X L 4)

# Chattanooga Gas Company ACA for Twelve Months Ended June 30, 2003 Response to Audit Report Recomputation of CGC Bailment Payment Based on VNG Sharing 2002/2003

Schedule 2 A

#### VNG Gain to be Shared

Line			Monthly Accrued Value		С	lonthly apacity telease			Total	
	1	Jan-02	\$ 292,288		\$	43,806	a/	\$	336,094	- a/
	2	Feb-02	160,643			44,114	a/	•	204,757	a/
	3	Mar-02	129,576			44,114	a/		173,690	a/
	4	Apr-02	160,507			44,100	a/		204,607	a/
	5	May-02	193,081			44,100	a/		237,181	a/
	6	Jun-02	206,546			44,100	a/		250,646	a/
	7	Jul-02	172,319			44,100	a/		216,419	a/
	8	Aug-02	150,492			44,100	a/		194,592	a/
	9	Sep-02	223,860			44,100	a/		267,960	a/
	10	Oct-02	240,725			44,100	a/		284,825	a/
	11	Nov-02	216,577			-	h/		216,577	b/
	12	Dec-02	217,628			-	h/		217,628	b/
	13	Total 2002	\$ 2,364,242		\$	440,734	_	\$	2,804,976	•
					% S	hared			50%	
					Amo	ount Share	ed	\$	1,402,488	•
										•
	14		\$ 6,688,964	b/	\$	-	e/	\$	6,688,964	
	15	Feb-03	2,373,149	b/		-	e/		2,373,149	
	16	Mar-03	(1,086,139)	b/		-	e/		(1,086,139)	
	17	Apr-03	526,763	b/		-	f/		526,763	
	18	May-03	347,145	b/		-	f/		347,145	
	19	Jun-03	,	b/		-	f/		591,306	
	20	Jul-03	(432,796)	b/		-	g/		(432,796)	
	21	Aug-03	(426,073)			-	g/		(426,073)	
	22	Sep-03	(482,702)	b/		-	g/		(482,702)	
	23	Oct-03	398,760	b/		-	d/		398,760	
	24	Nov-03	•	c/		-	d/		82,273	
	25	Dec-03	 886,986	c/		21,223	d/_		908,209	
	26	Total 2003	\$ 9,467,635		\$	21,223		\$	9,488,858	•
					% S	hared			50%	
					Amo	ount Share	d	\$	4,744,429	

27 VNG 2002 amount to be shared as % of 2003 amount to be shared (L13/L26)

29 56%

a/	VNG Sharing Report October - December 2002 Exhibit 7a
b/	VNG Sharing Report October - December 2003 Exhibit 7a
c/	VNG Sharing Report October - December 2003 Exhibit 7b
d/	VNG Sharing Report October - December 2003 Exhibit 4
e/	VNG Sharing Report January - March 2003 Exhibit 4
f/	VNG Sharing Report April-June 2003 Exhibit 4
g/	VNG Sharing Report July-Sept 2003 Exhibit 4
h/	VNG Sharing Report October - December 2002 Exhibit 4

#### Chattanooga Gas Company ACA for Twelve Months Ended June 30, 2003 Response to Audit Report

#### Recomputation of CGC Bailment Payment Based on AGLC Sharing 2002/2003

Schedule 3

Line		
	1 AGLC Sharing 2002 (Audit by GPSC)	\$ 996,123 Line 15
	2 AGLC Sharing 2003	\$4,681,076 Line 20
	3 AGLC 2002 Sharing as % of 2003 Sharing (L1/L2)	21 3%
	4 Chattanooga Sharing 2003	\$1,260,974
	5 (L 3 X L 4)	\$ 268,588

6 Flexibility Fees 3/1999-3/2001	% Shared USF Share \$4,512,352 85 50% \$2,256,176 43 a/
7 Capacity asset valuations 5/2001-12/2002 8 Number of Months May 2001-Dec 2002	\$ 166,020 52 /month a/ 20 months
9 Total Capacity Release 5/2001-12/2002 (L 7 X L 8) 10 Total USF Share included in Order 3/1999-12/2002	\$3,320,410 40 50% \$1,660,205 20 \$3,916,381 63 a/
Amount Applicable to 2002	
11 Flexibility Fees 3/1999-3/2001	\$ - 50% \$ - b/
12 Capacity Asset valuations 5/2001-12/2002 13 Months 1/1/2002-12/31/2002 14 Total Capacity Asset Valuation 2002 15 Total Settlement applicable to 2002	\$ 166,020 52 /month a/ 12 months \$1,992,246 24 50% \$ 996,123 12 \$ 996,123 12
16 AGLC Sharing 2003 17 Add Back Programming cost 18 Total Sharing 2003	\$ 4,609,418 c/ 71,658 e/ \$ 4,681,076 c/

a/	Georgia Public Service Commission Order Docket 16193, Dec 24,2002, page 3, paragraph 3
	Georgia Public Service Commission Order Docket 16193, Dec 24,2002, page 3, paragraph 3 and "Audit Report
	Concerning Atlanta Gas Light Company's Universal Service Fund", Prepared by Richard W. LeLash,
b/	October,2002 Schedule 3, Page 6 of 6
c/	June 15, 2004 AGLC Filing with GPSC for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2003
d/	Revision to Feb 17, 2004 AGLC Filing with GPSC for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2003 filed June 15, 2004
e/	June 15, 2004 AGLC Filing with GPSC for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2003 (Trade Secret Version)

### Attachment P

## TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY RECEDENCE

Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman Pat Miller, Director Sara Kyle, Director Ron Jones, Director



2804 JUN 23 - 614 C1 50

460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505 T.R.A. DUCHCH KUUM

#### **MEMORANDUM**

TO:

Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman

Sara Kyle, Director Ron Jones, Director

FROM:

Hal Novak, Chief 4

**Energy and Water Division** 

DATE:

June 23, 2004

REFERENCE:

Docket No. 03-00516 - TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY'S AUDIT OF CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY'S ACTUAL COST

ADJUSTMENT FILING (ACA) FOR THE PERIOD ENDING JUNE 30.

2003 Notice of Conflict

On June 4, 2004, the Compliance Staff of the Energy & Water Division filed its audit report in this docket on the results of Chattanooga Gas Company's ACA for the twelve months ended June 30, 2003. Because of my prior association with Chattanooga Gas Company during this audit period, I am excusing myself from participation as an advisor or a party in this matter Specifically, I was involved in discussions with the TRA Staff on the Company's behalf as it relates to Finding #3 contained in the Compliance Staff's Audit Report. Because the information resulting from these discussions is now under dispute, I believe that it would be inappropriate for me to advise members of the panel assigned to this docket. In my place, Butch Phillips will serve as the technical advisor for you in this matter

I have discussed this matter with the Legal Division If you should have any further questions regarding this particular memorandum, please let me know.

C:

Docket No 03-00516

Pat Miller

Richard Collier

Aster Adams

Eddie Roberson

Randall Gilliam

Greg Mitchell

Butch Phillips

Senior Policy Advisors >

03-00316Notice of Conflict